THE LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF
NORTH CAROLINA

THE COLLECTION OF
NORTH CAROLINIANA
ENDOWED BY
JOHN SPRUNT HILL
CLASS OF 1889

C286
C555
1947/49
v.2

UNIVERSITY OF N.C. AT CHAPEL HILL
00043186266

This book must not be taken from the Library building.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

http://archive.org/details/christianfrontie22barn

CHRISTIAN FRONTIERS

A Journal of Baptist Life and Thought

Vol. II JANUARY, 1947 No. 1

EDITORIAL BOARD

DAS KELLEY BARNETT, *Editor-in-Chief*
WILLIAM W. FINLATOR, *Associate Editor* WILLIAM M. POTEAT, *Book Editor*
ALMONTE C. HOWELL, *Advisory Editor* MARJORIE E. MOORE, *Advisory Editor*
SARA LOWREY, *Poetry Editor*

SOUTHWIDE ADVISORY COUNCIL

W. O. CARVER, Louisville, Ky.
H. B. CROSS, Nashville, Tenn.
GEORGE B. CUTTEN, Chapel Hill, N. C.
J. M. DAWSON, Washington, D. C.
CLYDE V. HICKERSON, Richmond, Va.
EDWARD H. PRUDEN, Washington, D. C.
J. C. WILKINSON, Athens, Georgia
SWAN HAYWORTH, Vicksburg, Miss.
WITHROW T. HOLLAND, Haynesville, La.
ADIEL J. MONCRIEF, St. Joseph, Mo.
BLAKE SMITH, Austin, Texas
HUBERT R. HOWARD, JR., Tulsa, Okla.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

LEE C. SHEPPARD, *Chairman*
FRED B. HELMS
CARL LEE OUSLEY
R. K. REDWINE
MARVIN L. SKAGGS
JOHN MCGINNIS
WARREN CARR
A. C. MCCALL
WILBUR W. HUTCHINS

CONTENTS

Editorials 3
Freedoms in the Soviet Union ..... John B. Isom 8
Current Trends in Religious Thought ..... W. T. Conner 15
Southern Baptists Act on the Race Problem ..... Walter Spearman 18
The "Average" Is Enemy to the Good of My Sunday School Class ..... Marjorie E. Moore 26
Her Name Is Mary ..... Mrs. L. E. M. Freeman 31
"Good Reading in 1946" ..... William M. Poteat 32
News 37

Christian Frontiers is published monthly (except July and August) by the Baptist Book Club, a non-profit fellowship of ministers and laymen. Address all correspondence to Box 508, Chapel Hill, North Carolina. *Copyright 1946 by the Baptist Book Club.* *Second class mailing privilege pending. Subscription price, two dollars a year; twenty-five cents a copy. Printed by The Graphic Press, Inc., Raleigh, N. C.*

Who's Who In This Issue

JOHN B. ISOM is pastor of the Saxon Baptist Church in Spartanburg, S. C. and has contributed numerous book reviews to this magazine.

W. T. CONNER, dean of Southern Baptist theologians, is Professor of Theology at the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Ft. Worth, Texas.

WALTER SPEARMAN is Associate Professor of Journalism at the University of North Carolina and has served as Managing Editor of *Christian Frontiers* during the past year.

MARJORIE E. MOORE lives in Richmond, Va., and is Managing Editor of *The Commission,* journal published by the Foreign Missions Board of the Southern Baptist Convention.

MRS. L. E. M. FREEMAN lives in Raleigh, N. C., where her husband is a member of the Bible Department at Meredith College.

WILLIAM M. POTEAT, secretary of the Y.M.C.A. at the University of North Carolina, is Book Editor of *Christian Frontiers.*

EDITORIALS

Christian Frontiers and the Liberal Spirit

CHRISTIAN FRONTIERS, a liberal journal of Baptist life and thought, is one year old today. Proudly we light the single candle signaling a year's publication. Our pride is tempered with humility. Judged by our own high standard, "speaking the truth in love," we have fallen short. Pride in our own convictions has, at times, colored our objectivity and wounded the spirit of love. Nevertheless, we have tried to interpret frontier issues in the spirit of truth and the generous response of kindred spirits gives us assurance as we write Volume II, Number 1.

CHRISTIAN FRONTIERS is a liberal journal. Liberal means free. Freedom to look at both sides of the questions. Freedom to withhold judgment until all the evidence is in. Freedom to resist that form of authority which has nothing to commend itself but the weight of tradition and the power of popular prejudice.

This freedom of which CHRISTIAN FRONTIERS would be the outspoken champion is nothing more or less than an application of Dr. E. Y. Mullins' moral axiom, "To be responsible man must be free." If the soul is competent under God to make a moral and spiritual response to the grace offered in Jesus Christ the soul is also competent to give a theological expression of the meaning of that response.

There is a growing tendency among some Southern Baptists to deny the application of this freedom of the spirit by the demand that all of us use our freedom to find a predetermined road. Our freedom is rapidly becoming the freedom to concur with the theological conclusions of our leaders but not the freedom to differ. For example, the Baptist Student Secretaries at a recent meeting in Nashville were presented with a brief mimeographed page entitled, "What We Believe." This tendency to draw up creedal statements with the implication that the creed expresses the conclusions of all Southern Baptists is a denial of the soul's competency to write its own creed. As a free Baptist I do not desire to

6 3/93

write a creed for my fellow Baptists; neither do I want them to write a creed for me.

This does not mean spiritual anarchy. Freedom consists in finding the right master. But the right master is the ultimate master—the sovereign God. Recognizing God as our master we find as Sidney Lanier found, "the freedom that fills all the space 'twixt the marsh and the skies." The sovereign God makes His will known to us in Christ. A knowledge of Christ comes to us through the Holy Scriptures, the accumulated wisdom of the church and the individualized Christian experience. To make any one of these channels of revelation the final authority is to practice idolatry denying God His unconditional sovereignity. When the church is made the final authority, we worship the church; when the Bible is made the final authority, we worship a book; when individual experience is made the final authority, we worship man. In each instance the result is idolatry in its most subtle form, denying God His rightful sovereignity. Furthermore, to demand that a creedal expression of any one of these idolatries be recognized as normative for all Christians is to deny to the soul its rightful autonomy. Reverently bowing our minds and hearts before Christ, who is the interpreter of the will of God, and seeking to abide in Him as he is made known through the Holy Scriptures, the church and individual Christian experience, we find the liberating truth that makes us free from the false authority of dogmatic creeds.

The liberal spirit would free us from the yokes of the past; it must also free us from the yokes of the present. When the liberal spirit crystalizes into "liberalism" a new idolatry is created and men are again enslaved by phraseology.

Proudly we light the single candle signaling a year's publication, humbly we confess our shortcomings. Sincerely we dedicate CHRISTIAN FRONTIERS to the service of the Sovereign God in whose will is our peace and our freedom.

Peace Prospects and the Red Menace

SELDOM HAS history presented such formidable barriers to a peaceful understanding between nations as those built up between the United States and Soviet Russia. Everything seems to argue for and augur a war to the death within the next ten years. First, to use a well worn phrase, there is the difference in ideology. The United States is still a great capitalist power, in fact, the last remaining one, and capitalism is the sworn enemy of the Marxist way of life. Economically the two nations are poles apart and there seems to be little effort or desire on either side to do anything about this distance. Hence the dark and fanatical fear in this country of any infiltration of communism into our political or economic life.

In the second place, our foreign policy is being increasingly subjected to pressure from the Roman Catholic constituency in our country. Politically and religiously the Vatican is, or wishes to be, just as authoritarian in its control over the masses as Communism. The world is not big enough for one, let alone two, totalitarian powers, yet these powers have come to a death grip in Europe. Hence the widely propagandized and concerted effort of the hierarchy in the United States to lead us into a holy war against Russia.

In the third place the professedly atheistic character of the Soviet regime incites much of the Protestant segment of America's spiritual federation to fear and hatred and to a vague feeling, reminiscent of the Crusades, that their Christian duty is to stamp out by war the heathenism of the heathen. This makes such Protestants ready allies of Catholic belligerency.

In the fourth place, however loftily the Soviet leadership extols such phrases as "the dictatorship of the proletariat," we in this country know that the Russian government is not in the hands of the masses but is controlled by a very few men who can rule the life and destiny of Russia's millions with an iron hand as inexorable and ruthless as any dictator's. And finally, the relations between the two nations are so difficult because, in blunt language, the only real

threat to America's undisputed military might in the world is the Soviet Russia, and vice versa. And so the peace so dearly purchased is becoming sickeningly imperilled by the growing rift between these two nations.

And yet sane, if almost desperate, men and women everywhere know that the peaceful answer can and must be worked out, and soon, or we shall all perish as surely as did Sodom and Gomorrah. Once again the prophetic and boldly imaginative voice of Methodism's Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam has been lifted among a confused people. Addressing the National Convocation of the Church in Town and Country in Des Moines, Bishop Oxnam assured his hearers that a "dynamic democracy holds the future" and that while "the world is drifting toward war" it could be averted by bringing power under democratic control and by establishing justice by the democratic processes such as the United Nations and by developing an American foreign policy "that faces the Russian issue in terms of the method of tolerance."

"We get nowhere," continued Bishop Oxnam, "by ringing tocsin bells, by digging our underground caverns and making ready for the atomic bomb of Communism. We win the future by moving into the sunlight knowing democracy is a better society than dictatorship can build. . . . Communism makes no heading where plenty exists. Poverty is the open door through which it enters. Communism does not reach the heart of a man who knows he is treated justly, whether white, black, red or brown."

In other words, the surest safeguard against the inroads of Communism in a democratic country is more democracy! The Rankin-Dies tactics of name calling and incitation to hatred and fear is representative of a mentality which has no other weapon, and wants none, with which to fight Communism, save words and wars. "Ideas," asserted Bishop Oxnam, "cannot be destroyed by military forces. An ideology cannot be suffocated by poison gas nor demolished by atomic bombs. Ideas are conquered by better ideas . . . the most certain way to destroy dictatorship abroad is to establish democracy at home." And since the names of these two zealots for pure Americanism have been mentioned it is good to quote the Bishop as calling for the removal of "injus-

tice suffered in the North and South alike by the American Negro to whom the Communist is whispering so insistently" and for the eradication of the "prejudice that stalks arrogantly in anti-Semitism."

As to the efforts of the Vatican to whip up a twentieth century Crusade against the Kremlin, Bishop Oxnam said: "Men who summon us to a holy war against Communism are not only declaring war on Russia, but are diverting our attention from the primary obligation to democratize our own economic, political, ecclesiastical and social life. Energy expended in fighting Communism, if devoted to preserving and extending democracy, would make totalitarianism undesirable and democracy impregnable." And this suggests a final comment: The nations in which Communism has made the smallest gains have been the so-called Protestant nations such as England, the Scandinavian countries, the United States, Canada and Australia. Is there not something in the very genius of Protestantism making for equality and justice and respect for the individual which, if exploited to the fullest, would ring down the curtain forever on Communism at home and the threat of war with Communism abroad?

Freedoms In The Soviet Union

JOHN B. ISOM

IN WHAT is known today as the Soviet East, just twenty-nine years ago, girls at the age of eight or nine were forced by their fathers to put on the Paranja[1] and marry against their will men they never had seen before. "The wife was a chattel in the East, a bit of man's property. In Uzhekistan the women slept on the bare floor, the men on rugs on the couch. Women did all the work of field and house. A woman in certain Georgian mountain clans was condemned to spend weeks before her confinement in solitude in a hut of slate. In winter time animals were brought from the stables to the living-hut to give birth to their young, women were sent from living-hut to stable. Kalmucks placed a woman, when in labor, on a dunghill. In the far north a woman gave birth to her children in an unclean, icy tent, aided by no human hands."[2] Female literacy was as low as one per cent.

Today women in the Soviet East, as in the rest of the U.S.S.R., are free. The paranja is a thing of the past. Women are free to marry or not to marry, protected by a law that fixes the age of consent at eighteen. In 1939 female literacy in Tajik S.S.R. was 62.2 per cent, compared with one per cent in 1926. In twenty-nine years the women of the Soviet East have risen from slavery to political, economic and social equality with men. Working women in the Soviet Union receive equal pay with men for equal work. Before the Revolution of 1917 women in the factory worked sixteen hours a day. Today they work seven hours, receiving free medical care, compensation for loss of time during child-birth, and are provided with nurseries, milk-kitchens for infants, kindergartens and playgrounds for their children while they work.[3]

---

1 A head covering made of heavy cloth—similar to a guano sack pulled down over the head with small openings for eyes and mouth.

2 Hewlett Johnson, *The Soviet Power,* New York: Modern Age Books, pp. 232-3.

3 Fannina W. Halle, *Women in the Soviet East,* New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc.

In 1918 only eight million children were enrolled in the schools of Russia. In 1938 thirty-four million were enrolled. In the U.S.S.R. education is free for every child from the well equipped nursery-school right up to the university, or according to each child's need. In 1914 seventy-two per cent of the people in Russia could neither read nor write. By 1939 literacy in the towns was 89.9 per cent, and 76.8 in the villages.[4] No nation, in so short a time, has done so much to provide free education for every one as the Soviet Union has done.

A people, who, prior to 1917, knew nothing of political democracy, under the U.S.S.R. has created the conditions for political freedom, that, to say the least, is more democratic than most of the one party States of our South. In South Carolina, for example, 43 per cent of the population is disfranchised because of the color of the skin.

In Russia all may vote. "Every individual of every race, color, tongue or creed, and of both sexes, from the age of eighteen years and upwards, possesses the right to an equal vote, a direct vote, and a vote by secret ballot. Priests may vote. Officials of the former Tsarist regime may vote."[5]

The censorship of the press in Russia does limit freedom of expression. But to say that the Russians have no freedom of expression is as false as the assumption that we enjoy such freedom without any interference. That the censorship of our press is less tangible does not make it unreal or ineffective.[6]

As for religious freedom in Russia, Dr. Louie D. Newton's report on what he saw and heard during his recent visit in Russia, and John Strohm's[7] report on the subject express the same opinion, which agrees in general with other eyewitness and official reports. From these reports there can be little doubt but that the Russian people are enjoying much more

---

4 Johnson, *The Soviet Power.*

5 *Op. cit.,* p. 305.

6 George Seldes, *Freedom of the Press,* and Marshall Field, *Freedom Is More Than A Word.*

7 John Strohm is a newspaper reporter, Baptist, Mason, and a Republican. He made a tour through Russia about the time or just after Dr. Newton. He had no official guide, talked to whom he would, went where he pleased, took pictures of what he liked and wrote his report without any censorship, except the request to tell the truth.

religious freedom today than prior to 1917, or during the early years of the revolution. At least, the churches of the Soviet Union do not depend upon the State for their financial support, which is more than you can say for the churches in some other countries. Neither do they depend upon a mill owner, or a few rich men, for their financial support, which is more than you can say for some Baptist churches in the United States.

To say that the preachers in Russia feel free to take issue with the basic principles of the political, economic, and social order of the Soviet Union would not, in my judgment, be consistent with the facts. However, I believe, it would be not much less true than O. K. Armstrong's statement in the October issue of *Christian Frontiers,* when he said, "Our pastors (American) speak without fear against sin in high places of the government."

In one of the largest cities of South Carolina, a few weeks before the Democratic primary, a newspaper editor approached one of the pastors of a large downtown church with the request that he write an article in support of the argument that the Negro people should be permitted to vote. The pastor agreed that a moral principle was involved and that he personally believed that all people, regardless of race, should have the right to vote. However, he declined to write the article. His argument for so doing was, "I am a friend of everybody and do not want to hurt anyone's feelings." What he meant is as obvious as if he had frankly said, "I do not have the freedom to express my opinion on that subject."

Does the pastor of a church in a community where there are about two Negroes to one white person have the freedom to preach, "without fear," the Christian doctrine of *Color Blind*[a] equality? Try it. Does a preacher in a cotton mill village, living in a company house, depending on gifts from the owner of the mill to take care of a sizable share of the operating cost of the church, have the freedom to give, "with-

---

[a] Margaret Halsey, *Color Blind—A White Woman Looks at the Negro,* New York: Simon and Schuster.

out fear," his moral support to the workers in their effort to organize a labor union? Ask one.[9]

To say that all the people in the United States enjoy, without any restrictions, all of the freedoms listed above, is just as false as it is to make such an assertion about these freedoms in Russia. But such freedoms do exist in Russia, and are far more commonplace in Russia today than they were before the Revolution of 1917. In a country where such freedoms were unknown, twenty-nine years ago, there is a government today dedicated to achieving the great freedoms that are defined and set forth in the third constitution of the U.S.S.R., which is, in some respects, "the most democratic constitution in the world."[10]

In the Soviet Union new freedoms have been born, such as the freedom from the sense of being alone in competition with the rest of the world for one's bread; the freedom from the fear of unemployment; the freedom for a people of a great nation to use all of its land, knowledge, means of production, and manpower, to produce the things that they need and want; freedom from the "acquisitive instinct;" the freedom of living in a society where personal "success is not bitter in the mouth because others are hurt by it;"[11] freedom from the moral debasement of race prejudice, made possible by removing the economic cause for such prejudice; the freedom to be challenged by, and work, with hope, toward the high Christian goal, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."[12] Such new freedoms are the offspring of the great drama now being played by the Russian people in the creation of economic democracy.

These freedoms have not reached maturity in Russia.

---

9 It would be an interesting study to make for the purpose of determining just how much, or little, the voice of organized religion has been consistent with the accepted political and economic principles and social customs in every age and nation. Such a study will, perhaps, show that the preacher, who assumed the freedom to take issue with such principles and customs, has been persecuted by the religious, political, and economic overlords, whether he lived in the age of Amos, the age of Jesus, or that of Paul, or in our time—in Palestine, in Russia, or in the United States.

10 Johnson, *The Soviet Power*, p. 302.

11 Harry F. Ward, *The Soviet Spirit*, International Publishers, p. 116.

12 The economic motto of Communism and still the cherished goal of the people of the Soviet Union, even though they are at the present working under the motto, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work."

They are yet young, but they are there, having been watered and fertilized by the tears and blood of the Russian people. Their outward growth has been stunted by the hot blasts of war, by the long wintry winds of prejudice from lands afar, and by selfish individuals from within, but beneath—in the perpetual spring of the people's heart—the rootage has continued to grow. For the Russians these new freedoms are beyond the stage of planted seeds, or pregnant dreams. To them they are a young orchard of freedom, having already borne a new definition of liberty, which in turn has nurtured new hopes, values, courage, unity, efficiency, and cooperation, inspiring the people to withstand the shock of the most destructive war that any nation has ever been called upon to endure, providing the confidence in the future to fight on until victory was won on the battle field, and to face the rebuilding of their cities, homes, and industry with spirits unbroken.

The well cultivated anti-Russian attitude and the fear of Communism in our country and other industrial nations can only be understood in the light of the influence of such new freedoms in Russia. The small groups of people who have become rich and powerful under the old economic systems are afraid of these new freedoms. They see, and rightly so, that such freedoms are incompatible with the old order that provided them with the opportunity to control and exploit the natural resources, and manpower of the world, for the purpose of getting and maintaining their personal fortunes and power. They are aware that, by perfecting these new freedoms, Russia can offer the common peoples of the world a richer and fuller way of life than can be had under an economy that must depend upon competition (the kind we now have) for efficiency, and personal profit for the incentive. Our economic overlords have sense enough to know that the economy of private enterprise (the kind they like) does not provide the collective freedoms necessary to use all our natural resources, knowledge, tools and manpower to produce the maximum amount of wealth. At the same time they know that in Russia such collective freedoms do exist and are providing full employment, full production, and economic security for all—things that they cannot hope to provide

under the economy that they control, which is geared to profit the few at the expense of the rest. Herein lies the real cause for their fear of Communism.

That fear is the driving motive behind "the Great Conspiracy against Russia"[13] that started in 1917. The sole purpose of the conspiracy was, and is, that of defeating the experiment in Russia, and by so doing make the world safe for the big money of the few, and equally as important, prevent the necessity of having to make any economic reforms in the rest of the world. Armed forces, sabotage, and political demagogues were freely used. Outlaws in high places were tolerated and armed to be used against Russia in hopes of crushing the new born freedoms before they reached maturity. (We fought the Second World War to keep from being enslaved by some of the outlaws that got out of control. It is not difficult to imagine what would have become of us, if the people of Russia had not done most of the fighting and dying for us. We forget so quickly.) False propaganda has been continuously used, and still is, to teach the people of the world to fear and hate Russia. Refusing to appraise the progress toward freedom by the U.S.S.R. in the light of Russian history, with no consideration for the little they have had to do with, the press of the conspiracy continues trying to convince the world that the Russian experiment has been a complete failure, and that not one new freedom has come out of it that is worthy of our consideration.

Nobody in the United States can escape the necessity and responsibility of having some kind of attitude toward Russia, and an opinion concerning the economic experiment that started there in 1917. World peace is being won or lost by the influence of these attitudes and opinions. How much are we trying to make them consistent with the historical facts and with the needs of the future?

I make no claim that I know all there is to know about Russia, or my own country. I do claim to have been, for nine years, a conscientious student of the two countries. I have tried to appraise the political and economic philosophy, and

---

[13] Michael Sayers and Albert E. Kahn, *The Great Conspiracy Against Russia,* New York: Boni and Gaer.

social values of both, as well as their motives and deeds, in the light of the Gospel of the New Testament. I have found, for myself, convincing evidence to make me say, with no little conviction, that we ought to thank God for the progress toward a better world that has been made in the Soviet Union; that in the new born freedoms in the U.S.S.R. there is a mighty challenge to mankind; that Communism is not our enemy, but that our fear of it is; that our troubles are to be found within, in the injustice of our practices, and in the moral unsoundness of some of our attitudes and assumptions; that we need most of all moral and spiritual leadership "on the forward edge of our age, at the point at which it is shaping itself into something new;"[14] that I pray for the vision, wisdom, courage, and love for others that will cause me to stand among the vanguards, who are fighting to shape a truthful public opinion, who are living at a risk to lay the moral foundation for a new civilization—a new world in which the common peoples of the earth may live in freedom from the fear of one another, in freedom from the fear of war and poverty.

---

14 H. A. Overstreet, *About Ourselves*, p. 274.

Current Trends In Religious Thought

W. T. CONNER

THERE ARE two difficulties in discussing this question. One is the difficulty of one's own prepossessions. There are certain tendencies in each one of us that control us to such an extent that we are liable to impute these to others. I recognize this difficulty. The trends that I think I see in religious thought generally today are so much to my liking that I am probably influenced somewhat in my discussion of these trends and tendencies by my own prepossessions.

A second difficulty is that of seeing the whole field. No man is able to do this. Each one of us is likely to see a section of the field and think that he is discussing the field as a whole when he may be discussing only a part of it. Very few men are able to take in the whole field in one view. I notice that most men in discussing current theology are discussing the section of the field in which they work and with which they are better acquainted. Recognizing these two difficulties, I believe, however, that one can make some general statements in regard to current trends in American thought and this would include in a general way English and European thought. Of course, European thought is not accessible to us at present to any large extent and only in a general way can one make statements about it.

In regard to these trends, especially in America, I would say that first of all there is a recognition of the failure of man. This could not have been said, at least in so emphatic a way, a quarter of a century ago. A quarter of a century or more ago, there was evident a great confidence in man and his ability to guide his destiny in this life if not in the life to come. This applied both to the individual and to society as a whole. I remember very well having heard men say about 40 years ago that the world would never see another great war. Since then we have had the two most horrible and destructive wars that man has ever known anything about. Back there, we had a good deal of confidence in man's inherent ability and in his perfectibility. Perhaps our thought

was influenced somewhat by the theory of evolution as applied to human society.

This confidence in man and in man's ability to take care of himself has now been pretty generally shattered. During the last quarter or half century we have made great progress in science. Man has learned to control and direct the forces of nature. He has not learned to control himself and direct the forces of nature to constructive ends. There is in everybody's mind now what we call the atomic bomb and the danger of its being used for man's self-destruction. In releasing what we call the energy of the atom, we seem to be getting close to the creative power of the universe. But the big question is, can this energy be used for constructive ends or will it be used for man's own destruction? This is the big question today in the minds of scientists, statesmen, and what you might call the common man. We do not have the confidence in man and his ability that we had some time ago.

One phase of this is the doctrine of sin. Some years ago the idea of sin had been pretty well banished from religious thought as well as thought in general. This may still be true in the minds of some people, but I think it can be said for thoughtful men in the field of religion now that they are coming to recognize something demonic in man's nature and life that must be taken into account. Sin is recognized now as a reality in human society in a way that it was not some 25 years ago.

Another tendency worth speaking of is the recognition today of the need of theology. There was a time not so long ago when many religious men looked on theology as something not worth much attention. A good many people followed Sam Jones in saying, "I am interested in religion. I don't care anything about your theology." But theology is the thought side of religion and men are now recognizing that man's mind demands its rights in religion as well as other aspects of man's being. Anyway, there is a more general recognition of the need of theology now than there was some time ago. What a good many people mean when they say, "I am not interested in theology," is the other man's theology. As a matter of fact, it is not a question of whether we are going to have theology or not, but it is rather a question of

whether we will have an intelligent and practical theology or one that is theoretical and abstract in the main.

I think I might mention as a kindred phase, the recognition of the need of revelation on God's part if man is to know God. Revelation was pretty largely ignored or denied 25 to 40 years ago. Now it is pretty generally recognized as a necessity if man is to live in fellowship with God. At least most of the men that I read after today seem to recognize that the initiative in religion must come from God. There are still, no doubt, some humanists left among us who would claim that the initiative is to be taken by man, but I rather think their number is not so large as it was a few years ago. Christian leaders today would doubtless not always agree as to the nature and method of revelation, but I think we can say that most of them recognize that for man's religious life, revelation is a necessity and along with this, our interpretation of religion in a reasonable theology.

I would mention another thing which I think I see in present day religious thought. That is a better balanced view with reference to the relation of the individual and social aspects of religion. I do not say the personal and the social, but rather the individual and the social. Those who used to advocate the social gospel are now recognizing that along with the social, the individual in his relation to God must be recognized and emphasized. On the other hand, many of those who used to say that the purpose of religion was to save the individual are now recognizing that religion must also have something to say about social, national, and international questions. I may be mistaken, but as I have just said, I think I see a tendency to come to what I would call a more constructive position on both sides of this question. Society cannot be changed without changing the individual that constitutes society. Changing social conditions will not change the individual unless we recognize that religion is fundamentally a personal matter and must adjust man's relations to God as a person.

I recognize that the above statement is somewhat sketchy and general, but it shows some of the tendencies I see in what I would call the most reasonable types of present day religious thought.

Southern Baptists Act On the Race Problem

WALTER SPEARMAN

DURING THE FALL of 1946 Southern Baptists in North Carolina, Georgia, Virginia, and South Carolina thoughtfully paused to consider the critical problem of race relations. They also took action. It was, in each case, forthright action, which required courage in the taking and will require both courage and considerable Christian determination in the subsequent carrying out.

In North Carolina, Baptists came out for a federal anti-lynching law; for equal hospitalization, education, and suffrage for Negroes; for equal wages and equal treatment of Negroes and other races on a basis of merit; and for abandonment of the theory of any racial superiority.

In Georgia, the Baptists deplored recent lynchings and called for "the application of Christian principles to allay growing racial tensions." They moved even further along the road of inter-racial understanding when they met in joint session with Georgia Negro Baptists in Savannah.

In Virginia, Baptists voted to accept the recommendation of their inter-racial committee "to strive for better health, educational, and working conditions" for the Negroes—and also agreed to call Negroes by the titles of "Mr., Mrs., and Miss" and to tip their hats to Negro women.

In South Carolina, Baptists voted condemnation of the Ku Klux Klan and the recently established Columbians, Inc., an organization in Atlanta, Ga., advocating white supremacy and a hate campaign against the Negroes.

These apparently unrelated incidents not only show a growing liberalism on the part of Southern Baptists in their attitude toward the Negro, but they show—and this fact is even more important—an awakening realization of the duty of the Southern church to assume leadership in a forward-looking Christian movement to improve race relations.

For one day at least the North Carolina Baptist Convention went on record unanimously as favoring the end of racial segregation in the church as it adopted the report of

its Committee on Social Service and Civic Righteousness at the 116th annual meeting in Asheville November 19-21.

Protests which reached the convention from various parts of the state and an uneasy feeling on the part of some Baptist messengers that they might have tried to go too far too soon caused a reconsideration of the action, the elimination of the non-segregation clause by a vote of 253 to 158, but the retention of a strong statement favoring equal hospitalization, education, and voting rights for Negroes, immediate passage of the federal anti-lynching bill, and "fair wages and treatment on a merit basis for Negro, Chinese, Japanese, and Indian employees."

Even after the watering-down of the Committee's original report, the resulting resolutions were declared by Convention leaders to be "the strongest statement ever adopted by Southern Baptists on race relations."

Commenting on the Convention's action, Reporter Colvin T. Leonard wrote: "Nor does the Convention's rescission of its original condemnation (of segregation) mean that it has compromised itself on this challenging issue. Rather, it might be interpreted to mean that the church, while moving out to meet the challenge, deems it wise for the interests of all races to continue a cautious but unrelenting advance . . . . The South, and North Carolina in particular, is making long strides forward in race relations. And it is significant that such liberalism as is bringing this about is not just the philosophy of leadership but is also the expression of what the average Southerner thinks. Finally, the Baptist Convention, by its action, made it clear that it is the church's responsibility to set the pattern for proper inter-racial relations."

To get a clear idea of exactly what the North Carolina Baptists did and what they refused to do at the Asheville meeting it is necessary to examine the action step by step.

First of all, the report on race relations was written by the Committee on Social Service and Civic Righteousness appointed by the Convention last year and headed by Dr. Louis S. Gaines of Fayetteville. The full report was printed in the "Advance Report of the General Board of the Baptist State Convention of North Carolina" and circulated among the 1,360

delegates. Dr. Gaines moved adoption of the report and the motion was unanimously passed, without any discussion from the floor.

The paragraph which proved most controversial read as follows: "If there is an equality of all men by virtue of their relationship to an impartial creator, and an equality of all believers who share in the redemption of Christ, such equalities must be respected in the body of Christ, which is the church. Therefore, segregation of believers holding to the same tenets of faith because of color or social status into racial or class churches is a denial of the New Testament affirmation of the equality of all believers at the foot of the Cross, and alien to the Spirit of Christ, the Head of the Church."

Adoption of this report on Tuesday was interpreted by some delegates to the Convention and by many Baptists throughout the state to mean that every Baptist church in the state would be open to Negro members. Other delegates said that the State Convention could not order any individual church to open its doors to Negroes and that the statement adopted was simply a statement of Christian ideals of racial equality toward which the church should work.

Reporting the situation in the Raleigh *News and Observer,* Robert E. Williams wrote: "Adoption of the report on Tuesday had caused a storm of protest and some commendation from all over the state; and some of the messengers today showed themselves as sensitive to voices from 'back home' as are members of the State Legislature . . . . Only about one-third of the more than 1,200 registered members voted and the charge was made that it was unfair for the Convention to rescind a former action with so few present, particularly when those who had returned to their homes included Dr. Louis S. Gaines of Fayetteville, chairman of the committee, and the Rev Das Kelley Barnett of Chapel Hill, who was the author of that particular section of the report. This charge was countered with the charge that the report, although read, was not thoroughly understood on Tuesday."

Motion to strike out the second sentence of the controversial paragraph, which contained the word "segregation," was made on Thursday by Dr. F. O. Mixon, pastor of

the Tabernacle Baptist Church of Raleigh. After spirited debate on the floor, this motion was passed by the vote of 253 to 158.

One other point in the original report came up for reconsideration. This was the sentence reading: "Agreeing with Mr. Jonathan Daniels that 'the need to eat is not racial', we advocate equal wages and equal treatment of Negro employees and the passing of such legislation, both state and national, as will assure this fair treatment." Here the objection was made by Charles J. Shields of Scotland Neck that this statement might be interpreted as favoring the Fair Employment Practices Commission. His amendment, which was adopted unanimously by the Convention, made the paragraph read as follows:

"Agreeing with Mr. Jonathan Daniels that 'the need to eat is not racial', we advocate equal wages and equal treatment of Negro, Chinese, Japanese, and Indian employees, and fair treatment and advancement of all on a basis of merit."

As finally adopted, the inter-racial report of the North Carolina Baptist Convention is a ringing affirmation of the fact that the race problem is a moral one and that leadership toward its just solution is rightly the responsibility of the church.

After citing Dr. Gunnar Myrdal's assertion that "The American Negro problem is a problem in the heart of the American," the report declares:

"If the problem of race is a moral problem, then the direction and dynamic prerequisite to its solution must come from the Christian churches, for Christianity is the heir of the Prophets' uncompromising demand for justice and of our Lord's teachings expressed in the Sermon on the Mount. Therefore, all questions of right and wrong must be evaluated by the churches from the perspective of the righteousness of God which is in Christ.

"Southern Baptist churches have not hesitated to bring the full weight of their conscience and influence to bear upon the social problem of liquor, but they have hesitated because of the tremendous pressure of unregenerate opinion, both within and without their churches, to turn the searchlight of the New Testament upon the problem of race.

"All over the Southland there are encouraging indications that Southern Baptists are no longer hesitating to deal with this most critical of all Southern moral problems . . . .

"In the light of New Testament teaching certain self-evident truths, which we have too long ignored, concerning the problem of race stand out. Any doctrine of racial superiority, whether it be the Nazi conception of Nordic supremacy, the Samurai conception of manifest destiny, or the Ku Klux Klan's propaganda of white supremacy, is a denial of the scripture, '(God) hath made of one blood all the nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth.' . . . .

"Furthermore, the New Testament affirms that the Christian ethics of race is powerless without the Christian spirit of grace. Only when men come under the atoning influence of the death of Christ can they renounce their inherited racial prejudice and be permitted to see that men are 'reconciled in one body under God through the Cross', and that 'there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.' The New Testament antidote for racial prejudice is the experience of redemption in Christ."

Then there followed the amended paragraph which at first contained the word "segregation." After that came the following unanimously passed statement on fair treatment for Negroes:

"We commend as worthy of the support of Christian citizens any effort made to equalize hospitalization, education, and suffrage among the Negroes. In particular, we urge fair and considerate treatment according to the laws of the State of North Carolina of Negroes seeking to qualify as voters."

The next paragraph was the quotation from Jonathan Daniels and the amended statement on equal wages and equal treatment of employees. It was followed by the two concluding paragraphs, which were adopted unanimously:

"Faced with the grim reality of 41 lynchings and the demonstrated hopeless inadequacy of laws to cope justly with this barbaric disgrace, we advocate the immediate passage by the Congress of the United States of a Federal Anti-Lynching law.

"We commend as worthy of increasing support the inter-

racial institutes sponsored by the W.M.U., the inter-racial meetings held among Christian students for the promotion of Kingdom ends, and inter-racial ministerial associations. Furthermore, we advocate the wide reading and group study of the book, *Of One,* written by Dr. T. B. Maston for the Home Mission Board."

If a dispassionate observer should try to appraise the real significance of the Baptist action and amended action at the Asheville Convention, he would probably agree with Reporter Colvin T. Leonard, who said in the Greensboro *Record*: "Action of the Baptist State Convention in Asheville this week condemning segregation as inconsistent with Christian tenets was an expression of idealism. Subsequent rescission of this condemnation was in the pattern of practicality.

"The fact that the Convention did a turnabout should not obscure the significance of the original stand, taken by Southerners in the face of deep-rooted prejudices and attitudes. Indeed, it is a long step forward when a generation not far removed from circumstances and conditions from which sectional attitudes on racial relations stemmed even considers a declaration such as the convention report was."

As a final postscript on the North Carolina Baptist action we might note the subsequent meeting of the West Central North Carolina Conference of the African Methodist Episcopal Church held at Monroe. How the Negroes felt about the rescinded action was plainly expressed in a resolution which said: "We feel that no other agency is capable of assuring racial justice and equal treatment and dispelling race hatred and segregation like the Christian Church." The resolutions also pointed out that "the Roman Catholic Church has made declarations recently for race equality in church membership, equal wages and treatment regardless of race or color, and banning of all forms of segregation."

In Georgia, where the recent return of Talmadge to power, the lynchings at Monroe, and the widely publicized establishment of the Columbians, Inc. have brought sadness and consternation to Southern liberals, an important and significant event in race relations took place this winter. White Georgia Baptists and Negro Georgia Baptists met together.

Members of the Georgia Baptist Convention were meeting in Savannah at the same time as the Negro General Missionary Baptist Convention. The way had already been paved by Dr. O. P. Gilbert's editorial in *The Christian Index,* publication of the State Convention, which had suggested: "Would it not meet with the approval of all concerned if this significant gathering of white and Negro Baptists should unite during the session at some convenient place and there celebrate the more than a century in which they have worked together with God?"

The suggestion evidently did "meet with the approval of all concerned," for when the question was brought to the floor of the convention delegates voted unanimously to participate in the joint session and there was not even any unfavorable discussion.

White Baptists adjourned their meeting and joined the Negro Baptists in the Municipal Auditorium, occupying special seats in the balcony. The Rev. Leander Asberry Pinkston, Negro president of the General Missionary Baptist Convention, called the joint session "a practical application of good will"; and Dr. Roland Smith, Negro religious journalist, said: "Black and white must live together in the Southland and the nation not as enemies or as persons suspicious of each other, but as friends."

In a resolution adopted by the Georgia State Baptist Convention the recent lynchings in the state and the hate-mongering of the Columbians, Inc. were deplored and "application of Christian principles to allay growing race tensions" was called for.

The action of the Baptists in Savannah did not go unnoticed by other denominations. Some weeks later the white Asbury Methodist Church in Savannah featured an address by a Negro college president, Prof. Benjamin F. Hubert of Georgia State College, a four-year Negro institution, on "What Religion Means to Me." The meeting was sponsored by the intermediate division of the church. Mrs. James Reese, a young people's worker at the Cavalry Baptist Church, spoke on the same program on "Universal Fellowship." Church leaders pointed out that this program was the first in their memory to feature a Negro speaker.

While these things were happening in Georgia, another step was being taken in Virginia. The Inter-racial Committee of the Virginia Baptist Convention, under the chairmanship of W. Wesley Schrader, carefully reviewed the recommendations of previous inter-racial committees for the past 10 years on such questions as separation in public carriers, discrimination in employment, lack of equality in educational advantages and facilities, and prejudiced voting status, then said:

"In spite of the indisputable fact that conditions are little improved we refuse to believe that our fellow Baptists have been grossly insincere in affirming a faith in the equalization of privileges for the people of all races.

"It is the recommendation of the Committee that we continue to voice our articulate opinions and to a greater degree strive for better health, educational, and working conditions of our weaker brethren. The Committee further suggests that in our private lives we extend to each and all the customs and courtesies of the hour. To the Negro physician, teacher, and minister, we shall address him as we do others of similar standing and to the Negro maiden we shall say, 'Miss,' and to the Negro lady, 'Mrs.,' and to both we shall tip our hats."

The South Carolina Baptists, meeting in Columbia, went on record as condemning the revival of the Klu Klux Klan and the establishment of the Columbians. They also charged that race tension in the South has been fostered by certain groups "to further their economic and political interests."

As each of these steps is taken in each of these Southern states, not only do the Baptists approach more closely their ideal of Christian brotherhood but they also give encouragement and support to other individuals and other groups in the South who would agree with Dr. Gunnar Myrdal that the so-called "Negro problem" is primarily in the hearts of the white people, where it must be solved as well as in the courts of the land and in the legislative halls of the government.

The "Average" Is Enemy To The Good Of My Sunday School Class

MARJORIE E. MOORE

NOBODY EVER had a new idea who was not later embarrassed, if he released it, by the perversions or the abuses of it. Sunday school methods are no exception.

The well-known six-point record system in common use in Southern Baptist Sunday schools has done much to cultivate wholesome habits of church membership. It has done some harm.

So thoroughly has the idea of the record system's importance permeated Baptist life that the invitation to membership in the business girls' Bible class of my church is declined in this way: "I can't be here every Sunday, and I don't want to pull your average down."

At first I took this as an excuse, a way to avoid saying, "No." Now I accept it as a mistaken though honest reason for refusing to enroll. I have a stock answer: "The average is not important to us. You are. None of our members attends this Sunday school every week. You will be welcome as a member or as a visitor, any time you can attend our class."

I mean it. Gradually I am able to convince them. Nobody is more in need of a personal, intimate relationship to a Christian church than the young adult business girl in a city. When she makes the effort to come to church at 9:30 on Sunday morning, she deserves a chance to worship, to study the Bible, to pray, and to mingle with Christian young women. The ministry of the church to business girls 25 to 35 years of age is my chief avocation.

Eighteen months ago, the Young Adult Department of 50 members in a church of 3,000 members was reorganized to accommodate returning veterans and their wives. Four classes were provided: one for young men, one for young mothers, one for young wives not yet mothers, and one for business girls. I accepted the responsibility for teaching the group to which I naturally belonged.

My qualifications for the job were not impressive, al-

though no other member of the class has to her credit a year of Bible in college and two years at Woman's Missionary Union Training School. Failure to prepare for each Sunday's lesson would be more impressive to this group! In their eyes my main qualification is the "Miss" before my name and my 40-hour-a-week job.

The class has grown. In a city where women outnumber men by several thousand, and in a church where women outnumber men two to one, it should grow phenomenally. In fact, for the possibilities which the census shows in the vicinity of the church, our Young Adult Department should have three classes for "white-collar" girls.

The group now numbers 38, of whom only 28 can possibly be seated at one time in the only classroom available to us outside the church auditorium.

We rarely fill the room. Many of the members spend every other weekend with their families in rural Virginia, (and quite a few go to Sunday school at home). Three have automobiles of their own, work five days a week, and take Saturday and Sunday for trips to the mountains or the beach. After an intensive week's work, a business girl is compelled to stay in bed a half day on Sunday, and occasionally a class member frankly admits that as the reason for her absence.

It is a standing joke among us that the B.G. Class does things by halves—half of the members attend one Sunday, the other half the next—but the department and the church have observed that any project our class undertakes is more than 90 per cent successful. The Sunday-to-Sunday class record is a matter for the seven class officers to consider in monthly cabinet meeting, but even there, the individual member, not the "average," is our prayerful concern.

Absence from class meetings, Sunday or during the week, never brings a scolding; attendance is rewarded by personal interest, a spirit of genuine appreciation, and a growing class fellowship rooted in a common serious purpose.

My major opportunity as I see it is in terms of Christian stewardship. To study the Sunday school lesson regularly with the needs of these particular girls in mind is one of the most exhilarating experiences of my life. What has the

Bible to say about the modern business girl? What is the Christian philosophy of life for a single girl of 30 in this city, in this region, and in this world today? How can a Southern bachelor girl be a Christian steward of her income, her time, her job or profession, her creative instincts and capacities?

More specifically, what does the story of Lydia offer Genevieve, my member who works in a tobacco plant as research technician, the sole support of her widowed mother and the moral support of her invalid sister? For Mary Katherine, the grass widow with a seven-year-old daughter, a stenographer's income, and a wretched place to live? For the bride-to-be engaged to a Catholic she met at the U.S.O. three weeks before he sailed for Europe? For Josephine, the high school algebra teacher who sponsors all the school social affairs but has no opportunity to meet eligible men of her own age and admits she does not consider education her calling?

Three-fourths of the class are office workers, two are nurses, three are teachers, others have similar jobs. The range in salary of the members is approximately $100 to $300 a month. Their educational opportunities vary radically; one left school in the eighth grade, one is a candidate for her doctor's degree, three have master's degrees. About half the members board; several live with their parents or other relatives; a few share an apartment with other bachelor girls.

The majority are normal girls with simple problems. Some few are facing the toughest problems they will ever have to solve. Without betraying their confidence I can suggest what those members require of their Sunday school teacher.

Mary joined the class a year ago. Soon afterward she went to a hospital for treatment by a neuropsychiatrist. She has improved steadily since then and shows keen interest in Sunday school. Recently she exclaimed, "I wish my church believed in Sunday school for adults. This class means everything to me." Lately I walked several blocks with her after church, and she confided what was to her a disgraceful secret, that she had attempted suicide several years ago. I am now in touch with her doctor, without her knowledge,

to make sure that I shall co-operate with him and in no way interfere with his treatment of the case.

Miriam is a grade teacher. She asked me to go riding with her one day and told me her story. After 16 years as a principal of a small country school, she decided she was getting into a rut, and applied for the hardest job the city system offers. Now she has 16 boys 15 years old with police records. One misstep on the part of any one of them means he goes "up the river" for good.

"I come to Sunday school to recharge," Miriam said with desperate earnestness. "Those boys' lives depend on me. I can't let them down."

Now I know most of them by name although I have never met them. Whenever there is opportunity, Miriam and I talk over her most recent problems. I do little more than listen; she has the job well in hand but she has to have somebody to think it out with from time to time.

Geraldine is a sort of baby sister in the class, only 19. She got in by mistake, but she was a total stranger in the city and it seemed unwise to insist that she join a class of her own age group after she attended ours several Sundays. She is an orphan who accepted Christ within the year she first attended church, at the age of 13. Recently a copy of her birth certificate fell into her hands, and she was shocked to discover that her birthplace was Brooklyn instead of the Southern town in which she had thought she was born, and the name of her parents as recorded, she had never heard of before. The name she has was given her by a foster family who forced her out of their home when she was a school girl.

"Where in the Bible does Jesus say we should have so many denominations?" Geraldine asked me in a letter a few months after she joined our class. She never speaks during class session but is eagerly friendly when spoken to and shows a child-like affection for the teacher. Later I received from Geraldine a packet of ten or more leaflets, cheaply printed and poorly designed, titled "Why It Is a Sin to Dance," "The Bible Says Smokers Go to Hell," and similar captions. When I saw her again I promised to discuss these with her when we had opportunity, but the evening she came home from church with me she wanted to tell me about her

fiance and she showed little concern about the denominational question.

The resources of the unmarried business women of any Baptist church are limitless. When tapped for the kingdom of God on earth, they are a vitalizing force in the community. To help bachelor girls cultivate Christian attitudes toward race, labor, money, work, war, vice, commercialized amusements, and all the major issues of life as they know it, in addition to the basic problems of adjustment as single women in a sex-crazed world, is to give to society one of its strongest assets. It is this result, and not the "average," that I consider important.

HER NAME IS MARY

MRS. L. E. M. FREEMAN

1933

Her name is Mary. I don't remember her last name. It doesn't make any difference, she is just our servant. She is a young woman—married I guess, because she has some children. She seems to be rather intelligent, and is clean and mannerly. Really we are rather lucky to have her because I can trust her and she knows how to work and knows her place and is always respectful. Lucky, too, to get her for $5 a week, with servants so scarce and so high.

1943

We have decided to call the Negro women who come to our interracial meetings by the same title we do the white women, that is, Mrs. Jones and Miss Smith. And, well—Mary is one of our group! But now I will have to call her Mrs. Jones. You see I have learned her last name. And since I don't meet her as a servant, but as a fellow Christian, I am beginning to see that she is a fine individual, with the same impulses and joys and sorrows and needs and hopes I have. Her children are in college too, doing well. She is as poised and thoughtful as any of the white women. I am beginning more and more to forget the color distinctions in that group. With our eyes closed in prayer we don't know whether the face of the one praying is black or white, unless we recognize the voice. And how at home they seem praying. They really talk to God. I am glad to be able to stop calling her Mary, and call her Mrs. Jones, as befits her dignity and womanliness.

1946

How I have changed. First she was Mary, called that to indicate that she was my subordinate, an inferior, my servant to do my bidding. It kept her "in her place." I have found since, that she didn't belong in the servant class, but under financial stress was big enough to be willing to be a servant. Then I grew to see that she was worthy of the dignified simple title. And so she became Mrs. Jones.

But since we have been in committee meetings and in group meetings these last three years, we have become friends. We write to each other when separated. She is Mary again. But what a difference in the content of the name. Now, it is the first name because of understanding and friendship.

Once again, her name is Mary.

BOOKS

"Good Reading in 1946"

WILLIAM M. POTEAT

Perhaps nothing is more arbitrary and subject to individual whim than one's taste in books—unless it be one's taste in neckties. This is why we have always found Book-of-the-Month Clubs of little help—just as would be a Garment-of-the-Month Club, or, as Irwin Edman has suggested, an Idea-of-the-Month Club. It seems to us that all of these matters depend so much upon what one's needs are that selections for mass distribution and mass consumption are quite valueless.

It is doubtless even truer to say these things of end-of-the-year lists of books, selected by book reviewers, since the choice is limited to the books that the reviewer has read and since his choice at any one time may depend upon the condition of his liver—or upon pure caprice.

The Book Department of *Christian Frontiers* does not intend, therefore, to hand down a pontifical opinion upon the "Best Books of 1946," demanding that its readers rush out to the corner book-store to buy this or that book before it is too late. The most that we can do is to recall some of the reading which we have found valuable in relating Christianity to the world and both to ourself. What follows is a list of books, which might be twice as long or half as long, which have been found stimulating in our situation, revealing of the world's state of mind, and commendable to all who are interested in either.

IN THE FIELD OF THEOLOGY

Revelation and Reason, by Emil Brunner, published by Westminster Press; *Faith and Reason,* by Nels F. S. Ferre, published by Harper and Bros.

The incommunicability of the concept of revelation to a culture such as ours, stamped by the empirical demands of science on the one hand and by the narrowly rational demands of philosophy on the other, has created a great need for and given currency to many books which seek to make the opposition between reason and revelation intelligible to modern man. This is no small task.

These two books, in a sense, hold both that there is and that there is not an opposition between revelation and reason. There is an opposition in the sense that the aspects of human experience with which they seek to deal are fundamentally different. They are not opposed in the sense that the findings of each may complement one another as parts of man's total knowledge of his situation without violating each other.

At the same time, both Ferre

and Brunner insist upon the ultimacy of revelation as fundamental to Christian Faith. The study of these two books together, and they are to be studied and not merely read, will provide an interesting experience because it will juxtapose the best theological thought to come from the continent with the best of what is being written in America.

IN THE FIELD OF SOCIAL ETHICS

Justice and the Social Order by Emil Brunner, published by Harper and Bros.

American Christianity has always been activist. Large segments of it have never at any one time been aggressively socially conscious in any comprehensive or comprehending way; it has often been timid and naive. There has, however, never been a great dearth of writing on the subject of Christianity's social responsibilities in concrete terms. But just as America has not produced—until recently—theology of world imminence, so it has failed to produce much of significance that seeks to relate the social responsibilities of Christianity to its theological roots. One thinks only of Walter Rauschenbusch and a few others. Too much is not being and cannot be written to interpret the social order to the Church. Too little may very easily be written to undergird with revealed values the moral demands of "sociology" written from Christian perspectives. This is why a book such as Brunner's is of such tremendous importance. Yielding nothing to the moral activism which is familiar to Americans, it is at the same time a searching, sometimes ponderous, but never unrewading examination of the conceprt of justice which, Brunner says, is destroyed by relativism in the modern world.

After an astringent study of the basic problem of justice, Brunner relates it to concrete issues in modern life such as the economic order and world government. This is a basic book, it will demand much of its readers; but it will reward in equal portion.

IN THE FIELD OF PUBLISHED SERMONS

Discerning the Signs of the Times by Reinhold Niebuhr, published by Charles Scribners and Sons.

Preaching as a sign of its time is long overdue for a revolution in the general cultural crisis of our time. Art, music, poetry, general literature, all the arts which serve to interpret man's life to him at any time, have in our age felt the pressures of inner restlessness and a sense of inadequacy which in every instance has produced a revolution in their form and substance which seeks more adequately to interpret man to himself in the middle of the twentieth century. No such ferment is manifest in large areas of the preaching that we hear and read.

Discerning the Signs of the Times is the most significant

book of sermons of 1946, we believe, simply because it suggests the possible direction of the revolutionary turn which preaching ought to take. The sermon on "Today," "Tomorrow," and "The Eternal" and that on "The Peace of God" are as different from some of our worst sentimentalities as Isaiah 6 is from a story in *Colliers*.

IN THE FIELD OF HISTORY AND INTERPRETATION

The Meeting of East and West by F.S.C. Northrop, published by Macmillan and Co.; *Last Reprieve?* by Edwin McNeill Poteat, published by Harper and Bros.

We have selected a very long book and a very short book in this field, both of which in very different ways seek to bring some freshness to the problem of the crisis in values in modern life.

Northrop's book is an amazing performance by a mind unimaginably comprehensive in its scope. It is an effort to find a philosophical basis for world culture. In pursuit of such a basis, Northrop examines the theoretic interests of the West and the aesthetic interests of the East and seeks to demonstrate the way in which the two together can contribute to the establishment of cultural presuppositions adequate for a world made abruptly a neighborhood but not yet a community.

Last Reprieve? is much more modest in what it attempts, but equally successful in achieving what it has sought. The book is the amplification of a lecture delivered to the American Society for the Advancement of Science and as such proposes that science in an age in which the language of science is idiomatic assume the responsibility for enunciating a system of ethics for our own time in its own terms.

IN THE FIELD OF CULTURAL CRITICISM

Essay on Rime by Karl Shapiro, published by Reynal and Hitchcock.

An essay in poetry such as this by one of America's outstanding young poets is important to anyone who is seriously concerned with the spiritual problem of man as interpreted by modern poetry. This criticism of modern poetry is not only itself a judgment upon the culture of our time but is a judgment upon its judges, the poets. The poem is divided into three sections: The Confusion in Prosody, The Confusion in Language, The Confusion in Belief. The last of these is particularly illuminating.

FICTION

The Stranger by Albert Camus, published by Alfred Knopf.

This short novel is recommended because of the insight it gives into the state of mind of the European intellectual who has been crushed by the experience of war. Written by a man who has been identified with the French Existentialists, that school of philosophy which has appropriated the pathos and absurdity of Kierkegaard's thought and rejected its Christian disci-

plines, the story illustrates the utter nihilism of the advanced guard in Europe and, therefore, helps once again to demonstrate the character of the effacement of the human image in our generation.

GENERAL

Kaputt by Curzio Malaparte, published by E. P. Dutton and Company.

As the author, a former Italian journalist of suspicious affiliations, says in his own preface, this is "a horribly gay and gruesome book." It is the story of the fall of Europe, and, as Clifton Fadiman has said, Americans will have to read it if they hope to understand the spiritual shambles which is Europe. Malaparte brings to this gay analysis an art which makes his book literature and a subjective appreciation of the sickness which is fascism which makes *Kaputt* an exciting piece of reading as well as shrewd, subtle and macabre social analysis.

FOR SHEER DELIGHT

The Wild Flag by E. B. White, published by Houghton Mifflin.

This little book, a collection of editorials from the pages of America's most urbane and sophisticated—and most perceptive—magazine, has more good sense in more good writing per page than anything written during 1946.

CORRESPONDENCE

P. O. Box 2144
Fort Worth 1, Texas
Dec 6, 1946.

Editors,
Christian Frontiers,
Chapel Hill, N. C.

Dear Sirs:

Professor Poteat's article on the condition of church music among Southern Baptists has come almost as the "voice of one crying in the wilderness."

He rightly places emphasis on the type of hymnal that is offered to our churches. In connection with this, it may be said that in 1926 the Northern and Southern Baptists cooperated to give us *The New Baptist Hymnal,* a rather good denominational hymnal. The value of this book is demonstrated by the fact that its popularity has increased with the years, so that today it probably enjoys the widest use among Southern Baptists in its history. No serious criticism can be made of this book as to the quality of the material that it contains. However, this book is now 20 years old, and the time has long passed for it to be revised and supplemented. For example, it does not include many of the best tunes of Protestant hymnology, from the ancient "Dundee" and "Passion Chorale" to the modern "Finlandia" and "Sine Nomine." It is especially deficient in German chorales and Welsh tunes, two of the richest sources of modern hymnology. As to texts, there are many worthy hymns, both old and new, which should be added. In this day, the need is especially great for hymns on

brotherhood, social action, and international friendship and peace.

To fill this need for expanding the hymnal, the Judson Press produced *Christian Worship* in 1941. This is probably the finest hymnal ever to come from the Baptists in America. However, instead of working with the Southern Baptists to make this book, the Northern Baptists this time turned to the Disciples. Why was this? I cannot believe that it was solely due to ecumenical preference among Northern Baptists. Indeed, our Sunday School Board had just the year before released a new song book of its own. Is it too much to assume that they were not interested in putting a good hymnal on the market at that time?

Let us look then at what our own publisher gave us while the Judson press was preparing a wonderful hymnal:

In the first place, although it is called a hymnal, as that word is correctly used, it is not a hymnal at all. The experience and good judgment of the years have gradually evolved a pattern of arrangement and format for hymnals in America which has proved very satisfactory to those acquainted with the field of hymnology. It seems that the Sunday School Board has never heard of this, for its publication lacks any semblence of good order or classification.

We have pointed out that there is much good material that should be added to *the New Baptist Hymnal;* however, this later book, instead of doing this has actually omitted much of the good in the earlier one! Instead of improving what they had, they have thrown away much of it.

However, the really serious criticism of this book is not of its sins of omission but its sins of commission. Professor Poteat points out a few examples of what is degrading in church music. The editors of this book have been particularly successful in collecting songs of this type. Professor Poteat points out three bases for judging the quality of hymns. He knows, and so should our denominational leaders, that these principles are not in operation out in the typical Southern Baptist church. Instead, it is up to our leaders to give the people what they ought to have rather than giving them a little bit of everything and hoping that they will choose the best. As a matter of fact, we are left to wonder if the leaders themselves are capable of evaluating hymns. With leadership goes the responsibility of leading in the right direction.

The Board has become the heir of the Coleman tradition. The dangers of this are apparent. Yet think of the opportunity! For the first time, our denomination has a virtual monopoly on the hymnal market of our churches. Here is the first real chance to give our people a modern, high quality hymnal. *Why cannot we now have a good revision of "The Baptist Hymnal" made by men who know the field of hymnology, music leaders of good judgment, with all other competing publications completely withdrawn from the market?*

Sincerely,
Joseph F. Green, Jr.

NEWS

Tales From Vienna Woods

By Jack Armor

Paris. (WP)—Men, women and children carry loads of wood on their backs from the famed Vienna woods for a little heat in the early freezing weather that heralds Austria's bitterest winter in modern history. Hospitals have virtually no heating fuel. Coal is not to be had, even on the black market. Electricity is turned off five hours a day. Lack of winter clothing, coal, housing and food has led to growing mass discontent and so forced the government head Leopold Figl, to plead with the Big Four occupying powers to send in relief shipments of coal, food and medicine before the expected cold winter brings accumulating disaster down on Austria.

While hospital beds are down to 2,500 for Vienna and 5,500 for the entire country, medicines and surgical instruments are lacking. Vienna's normally high tuberculosis rate is at its peak, with 31,000 active cases and more than 2,300 deaths from this cause in the first six months of 1946. Typhoid, diphtheria and infantile paralysis are increasing. Syphilis is 20 per cent above last year.

With insufficient medicine, a severe housing shortage which forces many people to live in the same apartment, and consumption of food at 1,200 calories a day—slightly more than half the subsistance minimum—disease is destroying the workers. Adults are 15-20 pounds under weight, according to official statistics. Examination of 64,000 school children showed 65 per cent undernourished, 25 per cent dangerously so. The future generation is paying for the war right now.

Suicides in Vienna have reached "alarming proportions," police officials say. Whereas in September there were 46 suicides, in the last few days of October alone there were 50. A large percentage of suicides left letters explaining that they could not get food. In some cases, women left notes saying they could not support their children.

WORLD COUNCIL ALLOTS $250,000 TO FEED CHILDREN IN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

Geneva (RNS)—Almost a quarter of a million dollars' worth of foodstuffs has been purchased by the Material Aid Division of the World Council of Churches for projected child-feeding programs in Germany, Finland, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, and Hungary, according to the agency's monthly report. Supplies include canned meat, vegetable soup, oleomargarine, and milk powder.

The report disclosed that eighty tons of glass have been bought

in Czechoslovakia for windows of churches in Hungary, and that eighty collapsible bicycles used by paratroopers have been purchased from army surplus supplies for use by pastors in Germany.

Other interesting items in the report are: two wheelbarrows were sent to Austria to aid church groups in handling relief goods; a portable organ was sent to a theological school in Berlin; and 1,500 yards of black cloth were purchased to help provide pastors' robes.

NO RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN SPAIN TODAY

Geneva (I.C.P.I.S.)—The situation of Protestantism in Spain is still extremely precarious. At the time of the promulgation of the "Fueros de los Espanoles" it had been hoped that true religious liberty would gradually be granted. But subsequent developments have shown that Spain still maintains in many essential respects a regime of religious oppression.

The "Fueros" acknowledged in fact only the right to hold *private* services of worship. Wherever public services are held they are merely tolerated, but not officially allowed. Moreover, the Protestant Churches suffer from the following further restrictions:

Protestants still have to send their children to schools where the "official" Roman Catholic religion is taught to all pupils and have no right to open their own schools.

Protestants have no right to publish their own literature, since all such literature needs the Roman Catholic imprimatur.

Protestants have no right to be married according to civil law. Those who are baptized as Roman Catholics are considered as Roman Catholics for the whole of their life.

Protestants are not being accepted for public offices even if they are perfectly able to fulfil such positions. The argument used in such cases is that "the State is Catholic."

Protestants are not allowed to proclaim the Gospel freely.

BISHOP OXNAM WARNS BUSINESS

Des Moines, Iowa (RNS)—If business leadership as a result of the elections approaches economic problems in terms of "breaking labor," an era of economic conflict will follow, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, of New York, president of the Federal Council of Churches, said in an interview here.

Bishop Oxnam was here to participate in the National Convocation on the Church in Town and Country.

"If business leadership," he said, "takes seriously the ethical ideas of religion and cooperates with labor, seeking honest solutions in terms of the common good, the future may be bright. If not, it is a dismal prospect that we face.

"The common people are not going to be crossed or coerced any more by privilege."

Here and There With the Baptists

Texarkana, Ark.—The Arkansas Baptist Convention went on record here as opposed to currently publicized proposals for state-owned or state-controlled liquor stores. The group also adopted a resolution "decrying the use of tobacco among our people," and another asking President Truman to recall his representative to the vatican..

Adopting a report of its Committee on Prohibition, the Convention protested against the federal government's encouragement of "bootlegging" by issuing federal licenses to sell liquor in dry territory. It was reported that there are 787 federal licenses compared to 504 state permits in Arkansas. Church forces have been able to ban sale of all alcoholic liquors in 31 of the state's 75 counties through local option elections.

The report also noted that "many church members are drinking, causing leaders to sidestep the liquor issue," and urged Baptists to "be total abstainers and to oppose the liquor traffic."

Another report took cognizance of the Convention's resolution of two years ago to repay all of a $600,000 moral obligation which resulted from the compromise settlement of a $1,000,000 indebtedness during the depression. The Rev. E. C. Brown, of Blytheville, reported that the Baptists have paid about half of the $600,000 and urged 25,000 memberships in a Baptist Honor Club, each member paying one dollar monthly during 1947, which plan would retire the full obligation by the end of next year.

Oakland, Calif.—A crusade to rechurch Southern Baptists who came to California during World War II from 20 Southern states will be started during the coming year, according to a decision reached at the sixth annual convention here of the Southern Baptist churches of California.

The convention voted to invite the 1948 meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention to California. The slogan "Golden Gate in '48" was adopted and will be presented at next year's national meeting of the denomination in St. Louis.

Admittance of Southern Baptist churches in California to the national convention of the denomination in 1942 was viewed as an infringement on Northern Baptist territory, and there since have been meetings of representatives of both groups in attempts to create a working agreement between the two Churches.

Montgomery, Ala. — Alabama Baptists contributed $6,000,000 for church activities in 1946.

A. Hamilton Reid, executive secretary of the State Baptist Board, said it was the largest yearly collection on record.

He said 2,500 Baptist churches in Alabama are planning an unprecedented program when materials become available.

Chicago—Only 38 per cent of the ministers of the Northern Baptist Convention have standard college and seminary education and 48 per cent lack even two years of college and three years of seminary training.

These statistics were reported at a meeting of the denomination's committee on theological education here.

The survey also revealed that there is a declining interest in ministerial training among educated young American men; that the demand for trained pastors far exceeds the supply; that the churches are offering salaries far below those of other trained professions; that the rural field has been "practically abandoned" to untrained or poorly trained clergy, and that individual churches are often indifferent to maintaining high ministerial standards.

Louisville, Ky.—A trailer camp for students will be erected by the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary here to help solve the housing shortage during the school's present record enrollment. In granting the seminary permission to erect the project adjacent to its campus, the Louisville Board of Zoning Adjustments and Appeals said the camp could not be used after June 1, 1948.

New York — A "Sunday of Sacrifice" for world relief and rehabilitation was observed throughout churches of the Northern Baptist Convention on December 1 in an effort to raise $2,000,000.

One half of the goal will go to the denomination's world relief committee for allocation to such agencies as Church World Service, Baptist World Alliance, and the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society. The other half will be given to the denomination's $14,000,000 World Mission Crusade fund for missionary advance, relief and reconstruction.

Mobile, Ala. — The Alabama Methodist Conference voted at its annual meeting here to participate in a joint Methodist-Baptist campaign to raise $2,500,000 for Birmingham-Southern, a Methodist college, and Howard, Baptist institution, both in Birmingham.

The action was taken after Dr. George R. Stuart, Jr., president of the Methodist school, said that both the North Alabama Methodist Conference and the Alabama Baptist Convention had approved the joint endeavor.

Savannah, Ga. — The Georgia Baptist Convention will establish a frequency modulation radio station in Atlanta and set up six other stations throughout the state, according to a plan adopted here at the group's annual meeting.

As outlined in the plan, the Atlanta station would cost $75,000 and would be owned jointly by the Southern Baptist Convention, the Atlanta Baptist churches, and the state Baptist organization. It would serve as the key station in a proposed state network. Denominational programs would be broadcast.

CHRISTIAN FRONTIERS

A Journal of Baptist Life and Thought

Vol. II FEBRUARY, 1947 No. 2

EDITORIAL BOARD

DAS KELLEY BARNETT, *Editor-in-Chief*
WILLIAM W. FINLATOR, *Associate Editor* WILLIAM M. POTEAT, *Book Editor*
ALMONTE C. HOWELL, *Advisory Editor* MARJORIE E. MOORE, *Advisory Editor*
SARA LOWREY, *Poetry Editor*

SOUTHWIDE ADVISORY COUNCIL

W. O. CARVER, Louisville, Ky.
H. B. CROSS, Nashville, Tenn.
GEORGE B. CUTTEN, Chapel Hill, N. C.
J. M. DAWSON, Washington, D. C.
CLYDE V. HICKERSON, Richmond, Va.
EDWARD H. PRUDEN, Washington, D. C.
J. C. WILKINSON, Athens, Georgia
SWAN HAYWORTH, Vicksburg, Miss.
WITHROW T. HOLLAND, Haynesville, La.
ADIEL J. MONCRIEF, St. Joseph, Mo.
BLAKE SMITH, Austin, Texas
HUBERT R. HOWARD, JR., Tulsa, Okla.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

LEE C. SHEPPARD, *Chairman*
FRED B. HELMS
CARL LEE OUSLEY
R. K. REDWINE
MARVIN L. SKAGGS
JOHN MCGINNIS
WARREN CARR
A. C. MCCALL
WILBUR W. HUTCHINS

CONTENTS

Editorials 43
Three Vital Issues ..... G. W. Strother 47
World Government and the Problem of Peace ..... Henry Brandis, Jr. 54
An Open Letter to Southern Baptists ..... G. McLeod Bryan 64
Books 68
News 70
Here and There with Baptists 71

Christian Frontiers is published monthly (except July and August) by the Baptist Book Club, a non-profit fellowship of ministers and laymen. Address all correspondence to Box 508, Chapel Hill, North Carolina. *Copyright 1946 by the Baptist Book Club.* *Second class mailing privilege pending. Subscription price, two dollars a year; twenty-five cents a copy. Printed by The Graphic Press, Inc., Raleigh, N. C.*

Who's Who In This Issue

G. W. STROTHER, Baptist missionary to China now living in Pineville, La., made a stirring address at the Southern Baptist Convention meeting in Miami on the subject which he discusses in his article this month.

HENRY BRANDIS, JR., is an Associate Professor of Law at the University of North Carolina, a member of the Executive Council of the World Federalists of North Carolina, and chairman of the Chapel Hill Chapter of Americans United for World Government.

G. McLEOD BRYAN has his A.B. and M.A. from Wake Forest College and has served as a rural pastor and teacher in Johnston County, as well as author of a weekly newspaper column. At present he is studying for his doctorate in Social Ethics at Yale University and serving as pastor of Olivet Baptist Church in New Haven, Conn.

RALPH McLAIN, this month's book reviewer, is Professor of Religion at Meredith College in Raleigh, N. C.

EDITORIALS

Christianity in Spite of the Churches

REGARDLESS of their politics few will deny that the Roosevelt administrations were the most humanitarian in American history. Yet the great social progress and reforms pioneered and implemented by the New Dealers were often achieved in spite of, and sometimes with opposition from, institutional Christianity. Recently another instance of secular religion or piety exceeding the righteousness of the ecclesiastics—and this time it is brought home to us—has come to light. Please God, it may shame and outrage the conscience of many of our Southern Baptist people.

On December 23, just at the eve of Christmas, President Truman announced the appointment of an amnesty board to study the cases of conscientious objectors to ascertain who among them deserve executive clemency and the restoration of civil rights. While this action falls far short of the requests of several church bodies in the United States it does represent a moral victory over (and it should represent a rebuke to) the play-safe, do-nothing, no-comment attitude of our Southern Baptist Convention Executive Committee. For just a few days prior to this action by the President the executive committee, meeting in Nashville, had in fact voted "no action" on a recommendation to President Truman that amnesty be granted to all conscientious objectors still held in prison.

From our convention headquarters come such grandiose slogans as "Launching a Century With Christ" and "Advancing With Christ." Sometimes one wonders just how much carry-through there is in these slogans. Shall Southern Baptists always be content with slogans while the world struggles in some areas to move closer to the realism of Christ? Shall our launching and advancing be forever concerned with additions, baptisms, budgets, machinery?

The vote "no action" on a recommendation to reimburse the Brethren Service Commission $17,708 for food and clothing furnished 45 Baptist conscientious objectors during the war is another question. Though our indignation is far from

spent, proportion and propriety enforce a restraint which permits us but to say that it is an honest debt dishonestly disavowed—and to add that it is small wonder when the official family of the dominant church of the South so acts that we are still called "the fire-eating South."—W.W.F.

Henry A. Wallace, Theologian

THE PUBLIC remembers Wallace the brain-truster, Wallace the Secretary of Agriculture, Wallace the Vice-President, Wallace the war expediter, Wallace the Secretary of Commerce, Wallace the militant leader of political liberalism, and Wallace the editor. But to most of the admirers and defamers (it seems there are no other alternatives) of this many-faced personality the announcement of Wallace cast in the role of theologian comes as news. Those, however, who have followed more closely the career and interests of Mr. Wallace were not surprised to read recently his public declaration that the Bible presents "the liberal point of view" more lucidly than the "modernistic jargon" of many present day sociologists and economists. They knew that the present editor of *The New Republic* has always had a deep reverence for and interest in the Scriptures, especially in the great prophets of social righteousness and in the social teaching of Jesus. They have, in fact, been assured that his militant passion for social justice and economic fairness is based on this devotion to Scripture. And they thank God and take courage when they read: "The essence of the liberal point of view is contained in Christ's doctrine of the individual soul—the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man."

"The Bible," he continues, "contains archaic language, but it contains truths in language people can understand. Many of the Old Testament prophets said exactly what liberals are saying today." And then he quotes such passages as Amos 2:6: "Thus saith the Lord: for three transgressions of Israel, and for four I will not turn away the punishment thereof: Because they sold the righteousness for silver, and the poor for a pair of shoes."

This, brethren, is our idea of the "simple gospel." This is fundamentalism after our heart. Amen and Amen.—W.W.F.

United Nations Without Benefit of Clergy

IT IS WORSE than idle to criticize the organizations of the United Nations for opening their assemblies without a formal invocation of God's guidance and blessing. It is in very fact to join the swelling chorus of "godlessness" directed by Roman Catholic maestros against Russia. No purpose is served by reminding the world that our American Congress has its chaplains, that prayers were offered at the Constitutional Convention when a great nation was born, that the Bible is used for this or that public occasion or ceremony. There are the bald facts that Russia has officially repudiated religion, that what official recognition the Orthodox Church has been recently accorded in Russia may be little more than political window dressing or expediency, that Russian atheism has been extended to nations adjacent to her borders, that Russia and these adjacent nations are part of the United Nations. And, in perfectly good vernacular, to all this we say, "Period."

We must never forget that our cherished freedom of religion means also freedom *from* religion for all who so choose. That is why it is so un-American and un-democratic to force the purveyors of atheism off the radio in our country as happened recently in a western state. That is why religion in public schools must remain elective. We in this country are still nominally Christians and the same might be said of England, Australia, Canada, and other members of the United Nations. It is therefore fitting and proper that a formal acknowledgment of this national piety be expressed at state assemblies and ceremonies. But at any international gathering which includes Mohammedans, Buddhists, Hindus, Christians, and atheists the insistence upon formal prayer becomes not only un-democratic but actually presumptuous and absurd. We must not be deluded into following the Roman Catholic line in thus feeling outraged that religion is being shunted aside in the United Nations meetings. We are

never more truly Protestant than, while warmly proclaiming our faith, we refrain from any effort to force it upon others.—W.W.F.

"Forward! Be Our Watchword"

IT WAS FIVE years ago when our nation was faced with the threat of tyranny that *Christianity and Crisis* was founded. Perhaps there is no publication in America so vital to Christian thinking on national and international affairs as this "bi-weekly journal of Christian opinion." In the December 9 issue there appeared a statement by the board of sponsors under the title, "Toward a Christian Approach to International Issues," which merits the attention of all who are "concerned to re-examine our faith in the light of world events [since] many current interpretations of that faith [are] not profound enough to help us to understand the tragic history through which we [are] moving." In this statement the sponsors outlined briefly and somewhat generally the approach to four urgent issues before the world today. It is not saying too much to term this statement a sort of manifesto of *Christianity and Crisis* for the coming years. The issues are: (a) the growing tension between Russia and the Western nations must be resolved, (b) the United Nations organization must be maintained, (c) the problem of atomic energy must be settled amicably and permanently among the nations, and (d) the principle of trusteeship for backward nations and areas must be frankly accepted.

The sponsors, and a roll call of them would reveal some of the greatest names in American Christendom, claim to have reached in broad outline an agreement in policy with regard to these issues. *Christian Frontiers* will not risk irreverence by hymning "Lead, kindly light" to this grimly realistic journal, but does take this occasion to express a warm gratitude for its five years of undaunted leadership and a prayer of godspeed for its future efforts to awaken us to the danger of a world "amid th' encircling doom."—W.W.F.

Three Vital Issues

G. W. Strother

I. Jesus and Race

WHEN I STOOD on the dock at Shanghai, just before sailing March 5, 1946, there stood with me two fine Chinese Baptist young people. They both were college graduates and wanted to come to this country for graduate work. They petitioned my assistance and I promised to do what I could.

On board the transport returning this matter kept recurring to me. I greatly desired that they should know Southern Baptists at home. I would want them to know what a great host we are; to know what a fine group of people they are connected with; to know our churches, our preachers, and our institutions.

In the last few years, the Japanese have made the Easterner very conscious of his race. All peoples are race, class, and nation conscious. The whites had spread their influence, their religion, their economics, their industry throughout the world. Their arrogance and immorality, in certain circles, gave the adventurous Japanese their argument. "The Orient for the Orientals" became their slogan. The ease with which they swept the whites out of the East has created an impression that can never be effaced.

America came through the war with still a large degree of popularity in the East, but that can easily change. Thousands of Chinese students now want to come here. What they see here will vitally affect the course of Christianity.

Naturally, one loves and is jealous for his own group. I want our visiting friends to learn to love the South and Southern Baptists. They will come to this country a people of another race. They will see two races living together here. They will see the white dominant, and they will see the Negro discriminated against, not because of his inherent worth or deficiency, but because of his color. There is no way to explain this to a people of another race. The way the Negro is treated in the South is also well known in social and political

circles around the world. By the enemies of Christianity this has often been held up to us as evidence of our injustice, and it directly affects our influence. A Christian messenger to a foreign land cannot but be opposed to racial discrimination.

Cannot Southern Baptists stand where Jesus and the New Testament stood on race? We know that before God, there is no distinction. Their repudiation of racial equality brought about the downfall of the Jewish nation. It was Paul's constant and consistent stand that the other nations should equally be partakers of the Gospel of Christ that brought on his widespread conflict with Jewish leadership, which resulted in his death. It is a continuation of this same ideology that is basically the cause of present Jewish troubles.

Southern Baptists claim to accept "the New Testament as our standard of faith and practice." The New Testament stands for racial equality before God. The South is largely a Baptist empire—whites and blacks. The dominant position, the initiative is with the whites. It is the day for the white Baptists of the South to stretch out a hand of fraternal fellowship to our black brother. If we do not, others will, but we will have lost our opportunity. We will have lost our voice of leadership in world missions. Our vision gone, our group will atrophy. We cease to be a living stream. We become a stagnant pool.

We know the historical background of the Negro in America. We know the political strife, the tragedy of the Civil War, and the crime of Reconstruction. In all this the Negro was a helpless victim of white exploitation. He was torn from his home and sold as a slave. He was liberated and turned loose like so many cattle on a range to shift for himself. It is time we Baptists do what is Christlike to help him to improve his economic, educational, and religious status.

II. Jesus and Money — Capital and Labor

During the dark days of the War in Free China, I lost all my possessions in a Japanese advance. The gift of $100 U. S. from a friend purchased two pairs of the poorest cotton pants, which shrank to where I could not wear them, two thin silk sport shirts, and two pairs of socks. Transportation was awful, food almost unobtainable, clothing and manufactured articles

prohibitive. We lived on in the hope that with the end of war, American products would flood the goods-hungry markets; highways, railroads, mines and factories would be opened; the missionaries would have cars and busses with loud-speaking equipment for spreading the Gospel. American war production had amazed the world. With peace, this skill would be turned into supplying the needs of the world. Then came V-J day and strikes. Strikes caught on and became popular in Shanghai and around the world. The channels of commerce refused to open; there were no goods for the markets; inflation increased; our hopes went glimmering.

Years before World War II, the Japanese artist, technician, and diplomat traveled throughout areas inhabited by the backward races. He studied their needs, and wove their life-patterns into cloth, tapestry, and all manner of goods. These things were mass produced by sweatshop labor, shipped out to all parts of the world by their cheap and efficient merchant fleet and sold at prices the British and American traders could not hope to equal. The peoples of the world are poor. They cannot buy high-priced goods, no matter how high the quality or how much needed. The Japanese industrial machine has been destroyed. The one who supplies the world markets must produce and sell goods cheaply. No nation can keep a large industrial economy unless it can sell beyond its own borders. It takes no economic statesman to see that if the finished product from the factory of a nation costs too much and is shipped in boats whose charges cannot compete with those of other nations, even though the goods are somewhat superior, they will not sell on the markets of the world and there will inevitably come economic collapse. In the place of lowering the price, having full employment and full production to meet the needs of the cheap and hungry markets of the world, we have done exactly opposite and we face economic suicide.

What is the cause of the condition? What does Jesus have to say about it? Do Southern Baptists not have some clear voice on the economic struggles of our times? If we do not, then the keen minds which seek social justice will look to others. But Jesus does have a sure word and we must stand with Him.

Apart from Christ the human race is dominated by three compelling motives: appetite, show, and power. All three of these are represented by wealth — money. Therefore, the struggles of men are for wealth.

Jesus divided the race into two groups: His followers and those not His followers. His disciples lived for God and others. Those not His disciples lived for self and money.

In the past, strong intelligent men by foresight, hard work, manipulations for capital and the skillful use of other men's labor, were able to amass great wealth, develop great enterprises, give employment to large numbers of men, and were great benefactors of the nation. These were the heroes, the "successful" men of America. In this struggle for power they were not always careful about the welfare of the men who labored for them and helped make their success possible. Keen competition caused them to keep wages low and make as little provision as possible for the welfare of their men. When the laborer ceased to be an economic asset his further welfare was no concern of the employer; neither was sickness, disability, or death. At their death they left large sums to their heirs, who were often unworthy and squandered it all in debauchery, while the child of the laboring man who helped make this wealth did not have the bare necessities of life. This was "rugged individualism."

This policy has been reversed. The poor, the laboring people, are in the majority. They have votes. They can keep their friends in power. So the laboring man was fed fat on the war. He now has the whip hand and has no desire nor inclination to relinquish his prerogatives. We cannot approve of lawless striking and violence.

Baptists are in a dilemma over this. We have been champions of individualism and initiative. Yet we have alike championed the cause of the oppressed. Furthermore, even though Baptists are predominantly of the common people, we have looked to our few wealthy for "large gifts." Many of us fear the rich, for we know their power. Many others have been greatly assisted by wealthy friends.

Baptists have tended to run their affairs on a semi-capitalistic basis: we tend to judge a man's greatness by the size of his salary.

The only possible solution is to stand with Jesus: whatever is a man's occupation, business, or profession, service to God and his fellow man is his proper motive. Money enough for his needs will come and is incidental. The rich and poor alike must be warned that this Kingdom of God is the only safe place for the investment of their money. We are in the investment banking business and our security is the safest.

Since investment is our business, the more a man puts in the better for him. The tithe was never Jesus' standard of giving. The nearer one put in all he had, the wiser he was.

Dare Baptists stand where Jesus stood? If not, why not?

III. Jesus and Marriage

We have always found peoples and nations where Jesus is not known to have a very low standard of morals, and their homes and living conditions are very poor. We have believed the New Testament presented us with one authorative standard for human conduct.

Marriage is a contract entered into between a man and a woman whereby the race is propagated and nurtured and the home becomes the chief cultural and habit-forming center of the race. The New Testament makes marriage an indissoluble contract between the male and the female, lasting throughout the lives of the two contracting parties, save for one possible exception; and to have a Christian home, both partners must be Christian.

In bringing those who profess Christ to the Christian way of life, we sometimes need to discourage plurality of wives, even to the extent of causing the man to put away all his wives, save the original partner. There are not many who will do this, but the New Testament standard must be maintained.

The best element of American life is descended from the Germanic tribes, who, historians tell us, were of strict monogamous habits. Greek civilization dissolved away in immorality engendered by the worship of immoral Gods, in philosophic speculation, and internal disunion, so that they easily fell before the Roman arms. Roman lords luxuriating with bathing beauty slaves, and Roman matrons, maidens, and youths who had forgotten the word chastity, with their mercenaries, were

no match for the virile, chaste barbarian. So the ancient civilizations perished; and a new civilization had to wait until it could be built on those barbarians turned Chrstian, a people of vigorous physique, stern moral virtue, and monogamous marriage.

Now America at the height of her new won glory shows all the damning signs of deterioration which marked the other nations for destruction; and not least of these signs is the widespread break-up of our homes, which is indicated by the failure of one out of every four wartime marriages. There is no use to deny that this failure is due to immorality and unfaithfulness in sex relationships and lack of restraint.

War is always destructive of the beautiful and good. It always unleashes and glorifies the animal, the bestial, the passions. Immorality thrives on warfare, and to the everlasting shame of our country, we have done little to protect our men from all the vileness of the gutter, and we have greatly promoted the interests of the brewer and distiller. One night in January 1945, over 30 of our planes were lost over the "Hump." How many of these were loaded with belated Christmas liquor rations? The shows and much of the literature were constantly suggestive of sex. I preached to one air base for four months and several said they had never heard Jesus' attitude on divorce.

On the Fourth of July I took my wife and eldest daughter to see the first picture I had seen in this country in three years. It was supposed to be good. It was so utterly and destructively immoral that we walked out. I will not say I will not go again, but I have been angry ever since. Think of the millions of American boys and girls, men and women, feeding on such carrion! How can we expect to produce good men and women? How can we expect to have Christian homes, teaching Christian idealism, virtue, and character to our future men and women, while their only center for amusement and entertainment is daily grinding out such filth? There is nothing sacred to the motion picture industry: the home is desecrated; lust is glorified; unchastity is glamorized; nudeness is paraded; morality, righteousness, Christianity, temperance, and the ministry are laughed out of court.

Jesus spoke order, security, righteousness, and peace in

the home. Society can be secure, churches can have order and the nation stability when we have homes built on the order of Jesus.

The present divorce evil has spread throughout the whole of our society; every family and church is touched, and the pulpits are not immune. Preachers scarcely dare preach on marriage and the Christian home. Some ministers have peculiar ideas on what constitutes marriage and large numbers raise no questions at all when they are asked to perform the marriage ceremony. One fears they love the marriage fee. Paul said, "Be not unequally yoked together with unbelievers," but not only do these ministers not state the New Testament pattern for the home, but they proceed to "yoke" up people contrary to Paul's admonition, while great numbers of our young people are being pulled into Roman Catholic circles, who are insistent that the children be reared Catholic. The Catholics have a united policy; we have none. There is one inevitable outcome unless God intervenes, and that is CHAOS.

If Southern Baptists will not stand with Jesus and the New Testament on the Christian home, then the missionaries have no choice; we must stay true to the only pattern we know for individuals, homes, and churches.

"Count me o'er earth's chosen heroes, they were souls
that stood alone,
While the men they agonized for hurled the contumelious stone,
Stood serene, and down the future saw the golden beam
incline
To the side of perfect justice, mastered by their faith
divine,
By one man's plain truth to manhood and to God's
supreme design."

—Lowell

World Government and the Problem of Peace

HENRY BRANDIS, JR.

THOUGH USE of the phrase, "World Government," generates in some people the reaction that something beyond the thinking capacity of the ordinary citizen is involved, the fundamental concept underlying the movement for World Government is extraordinarily simple. It can be stated in a single sentence.

There can be no peace without law and there can be no law without government.

This proposition has been demonstrated some thousands of times in the world's history. Peace is simply a relatively efficient preservation of law and order. As man began his struggle toward what we now call civilization, probably the first organized group to develop was the family. The family group developed a central authority—a method of keeping law and order within the group. That, in its way, was government. As family groups merged into the tribe, again governmental machinery was developed to keep law and order within the tribe. The principle has remained the same through the development of cities, city-states, nations and empires. While government has not always been successful in producing internal peace, no such peace has ever been preserved without government.

The keeping of law and order relies heavily, of course, on the willingness of the great majority of citizens to be law-abiding. However, when government is administered with anything even roughly approaching justice, that willingness is almost invariably present. But it, alone, is not enough. There must be an organization—government—to restrain the unwilling minority and to punish the transgressors.

We accept this fundamental concept without serious question as applied to our towns, cities, counties, states, and nation. We know that we could not have even relative law and order without our governments, our courts, and our police agencies. We further accept, without serious question, the concept that the power of the government must be co-

extensive with the area in which law and order is to be kept. We recognize that county government alone could not keep the peace throughout the state, as disagreements between them could and would lead to breaches of the peace; and that, for the same reason, state governments alone could not preserve law and order throughout the nation.

The moral, then, is certain and simple: *We cannot expect to preserve law and order on a world scale until we have a government whose power is world-wide.*

It is obvious that half-way measures, short of World Government, cannot hope to succeed. Postponement, not prevention, of war is the best they could provide. Of course, to those who accept, as a substitute for thought, the dictum that war is an inevitable human activity, it may make little difference what measures we take. For, if war is really inevitable, then there is a high probability that current scientific developments have signed the death warrant of our civilization and all that remains to be done is to select the time for the execution and to ascertain whether the attendant ceremonies will be spread over a few days or a few years.

However, as man has often demonstrated his capacity to keep relative law and order within the boundaries of lesser governmental units, there is no real reason to discount, without trial, his capacity to do so on a world scale through the device of a World Government.

The Present Situation

Only the most extraordinarily wishful thinkers now put any permanent faith in isolation or unilateral disarmament as ways of achieving peace. In the modern world isolation is obviously not possible; and unilateral disarmament leaves out of account the fact that human greed is at least as common a cause of war as fear.

More people put faith in heavy national armament. In an armed world that is a necessity for self-protection for any nation aspiring to be "great;" but, unfortunately, it leads to destruction of the very protection which it temporarily achieves. It leads to an armament race—and one is now in progress—the burden of which becomes intolerable, both

financially and psychologically; and, unless the race is curbed, its inevitable end is a "preventive" war.

Can an effective curb be achieved by multilateral arms limitation? The answer is "No." Previous experience as well as analysis clearly demonstrates that ordinary disarmament treaties are doomed to failure: (1) because nations, like people, cannot be universally trusted to keep contracts; (2) because the mutual suspicions arising from this obvious truth lead to "protective," secret breaches; and (3) because new developments in arms upset whatever precarious balance has been achieved. We are now hearing, in the councils of the United Nations, proposals for disarmament backed by inspection. That would help. But even completely efficient inspection—something extremely difficult to attain in all fields of armament—could not alone hope to prevent war. Its maximum achievement would be to provide enough warning so that an attack would not come as a complete surprise. The enforcement problem would still remain.

There are now, also, proposals to eliminate the veto as applied to inspection and to punishment for violations. These proposals are, in themselves, a confession that the present UN does not have power adequate to the job of keeping the peace. A very brief analysis will disclose why this is true.

The United Nations

The General Assembly of the United Nations is a valuable forum. Its discussions offer a basis for the formation of intelligent public opinion in those countries where there is sufficient freedom of the press to permit impartial reporting. But the General Assembly has very limited legislative power. What legislative power the United Nations has rests mainly in the Security Council. The same is equally true of the executive power.

The judicial power of the United Nations is initially vested in the International Court of Justice, or World Court. The effectiveness of the Court as a world peace agency is very limited because: (1) Only nations may be parties to a case brought before it; it has no power over individuals as such. (2) Many disputes between nations cannot be brought before the Court. (3) After the Court has tried a case, if the losing

nation does not carry out the decree, the method of enforcement is for the winning nation to appeal to the Security Council for assistance.

In the last analysis, then, the legislative, executive, and judicial powers of the United Nations are all dependent upon action by the Security Council. There five nations—the United States, Russia, Britain, France, and China—have the veto power. It is inconceivable that in the predictable future a serious threat to world peace will arise unless it involves one of those five nations or some nation backed by one of them. In such a situation the veto power is a barrier to any action except such as may be taken on a purely voluntary, or cooperative basis. The very situations in which there is a serious threat to world peace are precisely the situations in which efficient action to eliminate the threat is impossible. In other words, the United Nations, built as it confessedly is on the principle of "national sovereignty," has not yet advanced essentially beyond the stage of attempting to keep the peace by treaty. The five great nations have so far bound themselves only to discuss the problems which arise; and on each problem there must be unanimous agreement before anything is done, that is, a new treaty.

Changes Needed

What is needed is not the scrapping of the United Nations. That would simply destroy what little progress we have made. We need to strengthen the United Nations by amendments to its charter which will make it a true World Government with powers adequate for the job of keeping the peace.

Mere elimination of the veto power, without more, would not solve the problem. That would not eliminate the "sovereign nation" principle; and a "sovereign nation" can, in actuality, veto by action or non-action as effectively as by vote. Technically the United Nations Security Council could take action, even though there were dissenting votes from members of the "Big Five." But to enforce that action against "sovereign nations" would probably mean war. This will be true in the disarmament field if we simply set up an enforcement and inspection agency and eliminate the veto as to its activities. If, additionally, we give such an agency the power

to go after individuals, instead of nations only, we will have clothed it with one of the powers vitally necessary to any effective World Government. To the extent that the Security Council, acting without the veto, controlled the activity of such an agency, it would be the ultimate custodian of such governmental power.

However, this would still be a half-way measure so long as ultimate enforcement, in case of defiance, rested upon the necessity of calling into activity armed forces responsible primarily to individual nations. Each of such nations would, in effect, still retain a veto to the extent that it could withhold the use of its forces or could, in fact, use them as protection for its own defiance of the central authority.

Further, it is extremely doubtful that the present Security Council, even without the veto, would be a satisfactory custodian for such powers. Too few of the nations of the world are represented on it. However, the present General Assembly would be equally unsatisfactory, if not more so. It operates upon the one-nation-one-vote principle, and thus El Salvador or Ethiopia has as great a voice as Russia or the United States.

Also, if we approach the matter only from the standpoint of an agreement on arms limitation, the powers accorded are likely to be so limited that new agreements will almost immediately be necessary; and negotiation of each new agreement will present a prime opportunity for disruption of even the progress made to that point.

The exact language of the amendments to the United Nations charter which are needed and the exact powers accorded to the World Government under them will inevitably be the subject of consultation and compromise. No one person or group or nation can afford to say now that they can only be precisely thus and so. But the general outline is plain enough. The amendments needed are primarily:

1. The General Assembly should be accorded powers which are limited enough to minimize interference by it in matters basically domestic in nature, yet broad enough to allow it to deal effectively with disarmament and other matters directly connected with the preservation of peace, including the power to pass laws providing for punishment of individuals guilty of crimes against world peace. Very prob-

ably it will be found necessary to accord the Assembly some power over such matters as access to raw materials and barriers to free international trade. These latter are examples of things as to which there is room for debate and compromise; but the power to regulate or suppress the production of all weapons of mass destruction is clearly an absolute minimum.

2. The General Assembly, whether by use of a bicameral organization or otherwise, should be reconstituted on some basis of representation intermediate between the present one-nation-one-vote principle and the other extreme of representation based solely on population. Since either extreme would be completely out of harmony with the actual distribution of power presently existing, neither could reasonably be expected to work. The representative should vote individually and not by any national unit rule.

3. An executive agency should be created. If the Security Council were retained, this would be its function, though the present type of veto would be eliminated and the Council would be responsible in the last analysis to the General Assembly.

4. A system of courts should be established: (1) with much more complete jurisdiction to settle disputes between national governments than the present Court possesses; and (2) with power to try individuals accused of crimes against the United Nations, subject to a Bill of Rights designed to secure fair trials for those so accused.

5. An enforcement, or police, agency should be established as an integral part of the United Nations, dependent in no way on utilization of contingents from the armed forces of the member nations. Indeed, every effort must be made, at the very outset, to reduce the armed forces of member nations to those reasonably necessary for the internal preservation of law and order. Anything short of that is likely to end in failure.

The Opposition

The road to World Government is not an easy one. But we cannot allow the obvious difficulties to prevent us from trying. The necessity outweighs the difficulties.

Some people make the fallacious assumption that if World Government would have unpleasant features, that is a sound reason for opposing it. The fallacy lies in the assumption that we can avoid the unpleasant matters by rejecting World Government and still have peace. Actually the world has but three alternatives: (1) We can have another war so destructive of our civilization that World Government will become an academic question. (2) We can have another war, vastly destructive, but leaving something of our civilization. In that case, the victor will, of necessity, impose and dominate a World Government. (3) We can achieve World Government by peaceful means, with a reasonable chance of making it a just government.

In other words, if we preserve a significant portion of our civilization, World Government is as inevitable as the cop on the corner. The question becomes simply, do we attempt to work it out peacefully? If we do, we can probably minimize the unpleasant features.

However, a brief look at some of the ideas advanced by the opposition is in order.

1. "It will involve a sacrifice of national sovereignty." That is correct. But full-fledged national sovereignty is synonymous with international anarchy. Further, in practice, only a handful of powerful nations—possibly only one—can have complete sovereignty. Finally, it is obvious that completely unrestrained national sovereignty is as incompatible with world peace as completely unrestrained personal liberty is with the maintenance of domestic law and order. We cannot escape the necessity of putting reasonable curbs on both. Yes, World Government will involve some sacrifice of national sovereignty. There will never be lasting peace until some sovereignty is sacrificed.

2. "I don't want the Indians and the Chinese running the United States." But: (1) The probability is that representation within the General Assembly will not be distributed solely on a population basis, any more than it is within the government of the United States today. (2) The powers of the World Government will be so limited that we will still be relatively free to follow our own bent on purely domestic problems. Of course, the representatives of the United States

could be outvoted, but so could those of any other nation. Perhaps, as it worked out, the World Government would have a strong voice in some problems which some people now regard as domestic; and certainly the actions of a World Government would impinge on some things we call domestic. But can anyone seriously maintain that two World Wars have not impinged on our domestic affairs? Failure to organize a true World Government will not allow us to escape the influence of the rest of the world. Shortages, price spirals, a staggering national debt, veterans' problems—to say nothing of fresh graves by the hundred thousand—bear mute but overwhelming witness to the fact that our present ability to handle our own problems in our own way is far more imagined than real.

3. "It is impractical and Utopian." Utopian it may be, but not impractical. Most people who regard World Government as impractical apparently accept the idea that peace can be preserved by treaty—that is, by voluntary cooperation. The same people would never think of attempting to maintain law and order within their own towns on a purely cooperative basis. At that level they freely recognize the formula of cooperation as impractical and accept government as a practical necessity. The idea of World Government recognizes that cooperation fails when a sinner arrives in our midst and accepts the obvious fact that there will always be some sinners. Therefore, it is not only not impractical, it is the only practical plan for the preservation of peace.

4. "It will not absolutely guarantee that there will be no wars." Granted. Human nature is so far from perfect that no humanly devised plan is at all likely to afford an absolute guarantee against war. But World Government is most unlikely to produce a war which would not otherwise occur; and, on the other hand, it has an excellent chance of preventing wars which, without it, would most certainly be fought. Therefore, it is the closest thing to a guarantee against war to be found on the present horizon.

5. "What about Russia?" Until very recently the prospects of Russian assent looked dark indeed; and, while they are now brighter, it is too early to say that they are particularly bright. But we do not have to make a final appraisal

of Russia's attitude solely on the basis of the presently accumulated evidence. We must first get the United States to sponsor the proposal to amend the United Nations charter to make United Nations a true World Government. When that is done, there is a good prospect that the rest of the world, other than Russia and its satellites, will be willing to go along. Only when Russia is faced with the grave decision as to whether to join in or go it alone will we have to make a final appraisal of her attitude. It is very doubtful if Stalin himself could say accurately today what Russia will do if and when actually faced with a problem of such grave importance. Currently, our efforts should be concentrated on influencing the official attitude of our own government. Certainly any current appraisal of the attitudes of other governments, based necessarily on incomplete evidence, would not dissuade us from that.

The truth is that there is no really insuperable obstacle to World Government, nor is there any objection to it sound enough to justify accepting the virtual certainty of war which rejection of World Government means.

The Immediate Job to Be Done

The United States ought to be taking the lead. Its official representatives ought to be urging amendment of the United Nations charter. We are moving in that direction. Our official proposals for the international control of atomic energy and for disarmament clearly indicate that our officials do not believe the present United Nations has adequate power to keep the peace. But our official proposals are tackling the matter piecemeal instead of openly recognizing and tackling the fundamental problem in its entirety.

There are numerous recent indications that the people are ahead of the country's political leaders. A recent Elmo Roper poll indicated that over 60 per cent of our people favor the general idea of World Government. In a recent referendum included on the official ballot in Massachusetts, 74 per cent of those voting for candidates voted on a query which offered an opportunity to approve or disapprove the general idea of World Government. The vote was an overwhelming 638,000 in favor to only 74,000 against.

It is up to individual Americans to make their views known. We must unite for mutual support and multiplication of influence to the end that our leaders will make the necessary proposals. Those of us who are unwilling to do so must share in the responsibility for the failure of peace efforts which will be the inevitable result of inactivity.

Americans have, to put it baldly, a skin-saving motive. Since we first used the atomic bomb, it is probable that the rest of the world will have fewer qualms about using it on us than on anyone else. But, regardless of that, and more important, we have a moral responsibility to curb the power for evil we have let loose in the world. That responsibility is not to give the world an American-dominated century. There are several billion people in the world who very properly care nothing for such a century. Our responsibility is to use our full energies and influence in joining with others to create a government to which all the people of the world may look for peace and justice under law.

The Time Is Now

Many people are inclined to say, "I believe in World Government, but I think it can be achieved only over a very long period of time and it is a mistake to try to rush matters. We will only upset the apple-cart and lose what we now have." This is a self-comforting doctrine in that it obviates the necessity of doing anything except sit on one's hands.

The truth is that there is a far greater chance of losing what progress we have made through the United Nations by leaving it as it is than by advocating that it be strengthened.

Most, if not all, of us would prefer to move gradually if we had a free choice. But to have a free choice we must be convinced that we can preserve peace while we take our gradual steps.

As already pointed out, we are still essentially in the stage of attempting to keep the peace by treaties and ordinary diplomatic methods. There is nothing in the history of such attempts to make it reasonable to believe that they can successfully keep the peace. There is nothing in their history which even indicates that they can postpone war for a very long time.

Which of us knows how long we have? As for myself, I do not know whether it will be two, five, ten or twenty-five years, though I do not believe it can much exceed the last. I do not even know what countries might start the war. I do not believe at this moment that war is inevitable between any two identifiable countries within a definitely predictable time. But I am firmly convinced that all history indicates that our present methods—diplomatic jockeying, treaties, power politics, armament races—will inevitably lead to a war between two or more powerful nations in the not too distant future. Recent history indicates that such a war, once started, can and probably will engulf the world.

In deciding between gradualism and all possible speed, do we have a free choice?

An Open Letter to Southern Baptist

G. McLEOD BRYAN

IT IS MY OPINION that everyone of my fellow Southern Baptist ministers (every minister of every denomination which operates in areas making rapid strides toward industrialization and urbanization, to expand it logically) should occupy a New England urban pastorate for at least six months. Here in New England the acids of modernity have eaten away the wooly, soft, colorful down on the Bride of Christ's garment and have left it threadbare, with the warp and woof now clearly visible. Here the technicways of contemporary civilization—urbanization, industrialization, standardization, sophistication—are best seen at their self-defeating ends, playing havoc with the churches as well as with the hosts of ready conformers. What began here three or four decades ago is rampaging almost wholly unrestrained and uncombatted throughout the whole of the nation where conditions are favorable, and is sure to sweep sections like the Piedmont South. The lesson for my fellow-ministers is clear; the signs of the time are discernible; the hand-writing is already on the wall of mid-century New England.

Take the church I know most about, for instance, a fair

(literally a cloudy!) index into the matter: What was a community-family-suburban church 20 years ago is now a downtown church, located in an interstitial area, where factories are supplanting residences, where Negroes are occupying vacated homes, where the deacons are contemplating the erection of an iron fence around the inviting lawn in front of the church. Within a block, the laborers of a branch of a huge munitions plant are on strike; just across the street is the single competing Protestant church which had the name in recent years of being one of the nation's foremost churches in ministering to laborers but which is now retreating with its membership to a more suitable suburban environment. One block to the south runs the street which marks, by community agreement rather than by realty charts or city zoning, the dividing line between the whites and blacks; within a year four of our families have either sold their homes or moved from the neighborhood. The majority of our one-hundred-plus "seeable" members, comprising some 30-odd related families, from a book membership of 300 souls, have already made themselves scarce and are living in widely scattered outlying sections of the city. To cap it all, the community has become within the last two generations 75 per cent Catholic. That is the picture of its geographical and regional aspects—its ecology.

The membership itself falls into the typical urban pattern, perhaps a little on the exaggerated side, with 60 per cent over 50 years of age and only 11 persons enrolled below 25 years of age. The remainder are young and middle-aged couples, none having over two children and one-half with no children. If they intend to propagate themselves by the "time-honored" method—by church-family replacements—they are doomed and are obviously dying speedily. What few new members are added are fast offset by the death of older members or by the unnoted withdrawals and freezing of those on the fringes of the church-family and of the city community. The thriving Sunday School alone serves as a feeder for church membership, but it is only a temporary shot-in-the-arm since it is a phenomenon of the present pastorate.

What adds a sense of tragedy to the whole, above and beyond these gloomy facts, is the attitude of the church, happily

with some striking exceptions. Exclusiveness characterizes the church life, not exclusiveness on the lines of essential Christian beliefs or of denominational aloofness, but the natural exclusiveness of an in-group. Inter-family, backyard-fence friendships prevail, even though their lots are now separated by smokestacks and Negroes. They pride themselves on being the friendliest church in their section of Yankeedom, and they would be electrified if told that their church is doomed. Still they act so as to exclude new members; for while they warmly greet visitors to the services they leave the newcomers out in the cold, outside their own little chummy circles, and then wonder why they lose so many visitors and new members. Evangelism in the worst or the best sense is unknown. Over the years the church has succumbed, with the slightest protest, to the watered-down faith of undefined liberalism; it exists, with each Sunday's respiration more halting, as a deflated pow-wow for these once neighboring, comfortably satisfied petty bourgeoisie. And, though located in an area where as a church they could do much for laboring people and could build up ties with the Negroes and though four out of five of the memberships are to be counted among the laborers, about equally divided between union and non-union membership or preference, they keep their hands tied by deliberately remaining unidentified with their fellows.

Did I hear you say their plight may not be so dismal for their "religious feelings" have gone unmentioned? Yes, unmentioned, deliberately, for my point is that spirituality thrives with difficulty, if at all, under such conditions. Indeed, such a query would call for a definition of what you mean. Even so, the church in question is so accurately described in a conclusion of the recent Brooklyn Survey: "The more assimilated to the American type, the more liberal its viewpoint, the more dispassionate its tolerance, the more anemic its faith, the more individualistic its mores, the less (has it) prospered." Did I hear you say that this is an extreme case of a run-down church? Not if you hear the people of the church talk; the glory in their little clubs; they're proud of the final payment of their building mortgage this fall; and they would be dreadfully shocked to know that they are being numbered

with the dead and dying. The case in hand is simply a product of the "Magnificent Protestant Era" which built big and too often while the going was easy and didn't always look where it was going. This is the church to which I direct the minds of my fellow-ministers among the Southern Baptists, among the nation, and say, "Beware, pride goeth before a great fall;" after expansionistic tactics, after sheer promotionalism, after dinosauric membership rolls comes the mopping up effected by a new era and a different way of life.

But I dare to console myself with Elijah's balm; there may not be 7,000 who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal but surely there are some among them who will respond and break away from their ruts. With prayer and hope I have constructed and presented a plan of action; here is Protestantism's chance to show its colors.

First, let them capitalize on the unique position which has opened to them in being the only Protestant church in a predominantly Catholic area, become avowedly and militantly an undenominational church ministering to the working class, bravely restate and reinterpret the Gospel in word and in deed for the salvation of the community. Second, let them welcome association with incoming Negroes who hunger for fellowship and cooperation instead of indifference and brutality, and go on record as one church in this Northern city which accepts Negro members—and if there's need to soften this blunt Christian act, let them remember that perhaps few Negroes would want to join their ranks anyway! Third, let them establish a Christian Center, for intercultural, interracial, recreational, and religious projects of the community, building up one of the most neglected neighborhoods of the city by being community-minded after the Mind of Christ.

Do you think this New England city church will follow this Southern Baptist pastor? Or will it say not what some pastors said in answer to Douglass' questionnaire in Brooklyn, "that surveys are a waste of time as we know what is wrong," but that "surveys and directives such as the one our pastor has mapped are a waste of time as we don't see anything wrong?" What do you say?

BOOKS

Last Reprieve? By Edwin McNeill Poteat. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946. 105 pages. Critical Essay. $1.00

"This is one more in the spate of books, monographs, essays, and miscellaneous reflections that the atom bomb has inspired—or if inspired be too ingratiating a word, exploded." Thus the author correctly begins his critical essay which aims to analyze the condition of man and forthrightly suggest a technique whereby the answer to his dilemma may be found.

More and more it is realized that we need today a fresh vision that will capture the imagination of men. In another age Augustine's *City of God* captured men sufficiently to motivate a new order when his civilization had gone to pieces. Where shall we look in our day? What will be the source of an answer that will grip and move men to build aright?

The answer to these questions is dependent on what one analyzes the situation to be, and behind that, to what one believes human existence to be all about. In the author's analysis of our situation he points out that (1) "we have entered a new age"; and (2) "we are afraid of what may happen to our civilization."

If these conditions have come upon us unexpectedly and are to some extent unwanted, then what have men been wanting and expecting? Again, two things: happiness and security, or pleasure and power. The author cleverly handles the hedonistic paradox by affirming the pursuit of pleasures as a practical matter, but finding that it is at the point of means (here power) that we need to scrutinize our plans most carefully. "Somewhere along the road during the past two hundred years, Western man has lost his way."

How shall we resolve the dilemma of being both strong and happy without going into fear and destruction? "We must find man's ultimate dependence, ultimate in terms of its ability to accommodate both his wish to be strong and his need to be happy." The answer lies in submitting ourselves to "the Moral Order"—"objective pragmatic moral laws observable in the nature of behavior . . ." Certainly both scientists and statesmen have been calling for moral guidance. How shall we go about looking for this kind of "ultimate?"

The author's suggestion emerges from the characteristic technique which our age has developed: the scientific method. He would have it applied by a congress of scientific specialists so as to describe the laws of human behavior, which when obeyed lead to happiness and security; denied, lead to misery and destruction. Call together anthropologist, historian, sociologist, endocrinologist, psychiatrist, psychologist, physicist, chemist, *etc.* Out of such a "World Congress on Morals" let there emerge from a thoroughly empirical study such statements of moral laws as our nations and international order requires.

We wonder what would result. May not the scientist as a scientist find himself in a peculiar position? One of the naive assumptions which recent years have seen exploded is that our vaunted belief in our objectivity in dealing with "facts, facts, facts" failed to realize that all observation is made from some particular point of view. And basic assumptions concerning the universe are all leaps of faith which are not subject to investigation by the scientific method. Working with the measurable, the statistical averages, we desire to state the observable sequences which occur with relative dependability. But can this procedure get us farther toward man's final dependence than our great astro-physicists have gotten in recognizing that behind all this empirically measured phenomena we *must* postulate something—but we can't get to it by our scientific methods.

What then of such a "congress" discovering the "Moral Order," or the moral laws in human behavior. Even if stated, we would still need to inquire for something more adequate. What would be their sustaining source? Can we safely neglect the possibility that the beginning point must be from the "beyond that is akin?" Or better still, begin from both sides at once, giving the priority to God?

Possibly the author is subtly hinting at this when he made the suggestion of a scientists' "World Congress on Morals." Such a congress, he writes, is to be "not under theological or philosophical auspices, however. We are not now being asked for such guidance. Maybe that's what the world needs, but this is no time to insist on it." Would they reach the point of realizing the relevance of God?

To many readers it will further seem that a moral creed must approve itself two ways, *both* rationally and empirically. Its inner coherence or rationality must be harmonious in holding together all the elements of experience at every range or level of being. The Christian ethicist finds the key feature of all experience to be in those experiences of Divine activity in history in Israel from Abram and Moses to all that Jesus Christ is and means. To call a congress for empirically arrived at statements without examination of the participants' primary assumptions as to what human existence is all about may result only in confusion.

Certainly it is true that we need free and unhampered search concerning facts in every area. The author's "Congress" could function well as a beginning in bringing together a mass of data with the results of many specialists in the sciences balanced against each other and thus freed from distortions. We wish a beginning like that could be made.

Beyond such an accumulation of information about human behavior we need more urgently an adequately stated presupposition by which all this information must be approached. Ethics is not enough. Without metaphysical or religious rootage

moral ideals are impotent. Maybe it is this which is involved in the author's words quoted above and interpreted as a subtle hint concerning what such a congress would have to realize finally. With only 105 pages in the book it would have been most helpful if the author had added a couple of chapters to develop the relationship between the empirically gathered behavior statements and a word-view.

In this book as in his earlier volumes, the author's brilliance in turning an apt phrase and stirring one's imagination is manifest on every page. One may venture to suggest that a number of sermons will be worked from his two or three page vivid recounting and interpretation of the parable of "The Barren Fig Tree" at the beginning of the book and the equally suggestive treatment of the Tower of Siloam. No book is quite so stimulating as one which comes forth with definite proposals for us to face. This book does just that. We need such stimulation for both thought and action.

Ralph E. McLain

NEWS

TRENDS TOWARD UNION OF RELIGIOUS GROUPS

Wilmington, Del. (RNS)—Asserting that 1947 is the year for Protestants "to think and battle for church union," Dr. Oliver J. Collins, superintendent of the Wilmington District of the Peninsula Conference, the Methodist Church, called here for merger of the Protestant Episcopal and Methodist churches.

He asserted that "it is time for us to bury the hatchet that severed the Methodist Societies from the Anglican Communion. We have much in common. The Methodist Church had enough evangelical fervor to increase its membership during the conference year 1945-46 by one million souls. Anglicanism has displayed a vigorous, dynamic churchmanship."

Atlanta, Ga. (RNS)—Plans for the merger of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and the Presbyterian Church in the U.S. (Southern) have progressed "most satisfactorily," it was announced here by leaders of both denominations following a four-day conference on the proposed union.

The denominational leaders comprised a joint drafting committee, and the sessions here were devoted to completion of plans for amalgamation of two church divisions which have existed since the Civil War.

Main points considered during the sessions involved general regional organization, method of representation, degree of authority and jurisdictional to be granted synods, arrangements for administrative headquarters in the regional areas, and qualifications required for church membership.

Here and There with the Baptists

Little Rock, Ark. (RNS)—Arkansas Baptists made gains in every phase of their activity the past year, the Rev. Taylor Stanfill, recording secretary of the Arkansas Baptist State Convention, announced.

Membership of the churches now stands at 185,128, a gain of 4,068 during the year. There were 9,941 baptisms during 1946, a gain of 402 over 1945. Grand total of gifts for the year was $4,058,590, an increase of $774,486 over 1945.

Columbus, Ohio (RNS) — The Northern Baptist Convention's World Mission Crusade drive to raise $14,000,000 for postwar relief, reconstruction, rehabilitation and evangelism already has passed the $8,000,000 mark, it was announced here at a meeting of the denomination's General Council and Council on Finance and Promotion.

According to Dr. C. Oscar Johnson, of St. Louis, national chairman of the Crusade's Committee of a Thousand, the $14,000,000 goal will be reached by April 30, 1947 "if we continue to follow the course and the pace that has been set since the intensive part of this Crusade was launched on September 1."

Memphis, Tenn. (RNS) — Establishment of blood banks in hospitals throughout the South and the donation of 1,000,000 pints of blood by Baptist men has been suggested as a 1947 project of the Baptist Brotherhood of the South.

Lawson H. Cooke, southwide executive secretary, made the announcement at the annual meeting of the State Brotherhood Secretaries Association. He said that conversations are now in progress with physicians and hospitals to ascertain the practicality and the possible extent of this Brotherhood project.

Dallas, Texas (RNS)—Baptist groups in 14 Texas cities have applied for stations in the proposed Baptist state frequency modulation network, and a research fund of $175,000 has been allotted to begin operation. However, it is expected that it will take a year for the network to start.

Applications for Baptist-operated FM stations include groups from Houston, Mt. Pleasant, Lubbock, Dallas, Harlingen, Tyler, and Henderson, as well as Baylor University at Waco, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary at Fort Worth, Howard Payne College at Brownwood, and Hardin-Simmons University at Abilene.

Fort Worth, Texas (RNS) — The Rev. C. E. Matthews, superintendent of evangelism of the Texas State Baptist Convention here, has been appointed evangelism superintendent of the Southern Baptist Convention.

Mr. Matthews originated the Texas Baptist plan of mass evan-

gelism through simultaneous revival meetings by all churches. He hopes to standardize the program of evangelism for all 20 states of the Southern Baptist area.

Los Angeles (RNS)—To minister to the cultural and spiritual needs of Negroes, Japanese, and white residents of this community, a $250,000 church, Trinity Baptist, is to be built here. According to plans of the pastor, Dr. Jonathon Gaston, one aim of the church will be "to fight disease, crime and delinquency."

Richmond, Va. (RNS)—Total receipts of the foreign mission board of the Southern Baptist Convention during the first 11 months of 1946 were $7,930,899, more than double last year's total for the same period, and the highest amount in its 101-year history, it was reported at a meeting of the board here by E. P. Buxton, treasurer.

Dr. M. Theron Rankin, executive secretary, told the board that the anticipated income for 1947 will total $4,000,000.

Eastman, Ga. (RNS) — Sometimes sermons are irresistible.

The Rev. Max O'Neal, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Eastman, recently delivered a sermon entitled "Do Not Sin Against the Children," in which he denounced Eastman's old, rickety public school building.

Within 24 hours after his talk, members of the congregation made arrangements for a mass meeting. Preparations were so complete that practically all of Eastman's 3,311 citizens attended. The mass meeting brought contributions amounting to $40,000 in cash toward construction of a new school building and an additional $10,000-worth of pledges of materials and personal services.

Nashville, Tenn. (RNS) — Establishment of a fourth seminary by the Southern Baptist Convention, the new one being somewhere on the southeastern Atlantic coast, appeared almost a certainty with decision of the Convention's Executive Committee here to recommend such action to the Convention meeting at Saint Louis next May.

Wake Forest College campus at Wake Forest, N. C., is considered a prime contender for location of the new seminary, if founded. The college, one of the most historic and well-known institutions in the denomination, is being moved to Winston-Salem, so as to be eligible for a grant of more than $10,000,000 from the Reynolds foundation.

Nashville, Tenn. (RNS) — A total of 13,000 churches in the Southern Baptist Convention are planning building projects estimated to cost $250,000,000 as soon as building materials are available.

The estimate was made by Dr. J. O. Williams to the December meeting of the Baptist Sunday School Board, the result of a survey by the Department of Church Architecture.

CHRISTIAN FRONTIERS

A Journal of Baptist Life and Thought

Vol. II MARCH, 1947 No. 3

EDITORIAL BOARD

DAS KELLEY BARNETT, *Editor-in-Chief*
WILLIAM W. FINLATOR, *Associate Editor* WILLIAM M. POTEAT, *Book Editor*
ALMONTE C. HOWELL, *Advisory Editor* MARJORIE E. MOORE, *Advisory Editor*
SARA LOWREY, *Poetry Editor*

SOUTHWIDE ADVISORY COUNCIL

W. O. CARVER, Louisville, Ky.
H. B. CROSS, Nashville, Tenn.
GEORGE B. CUTTEN, Chapel Hill, N. C.
J. M. DAWSON, Washington, D. C.
CLYDE V. HICKERSON, Richmond, Va.
EDWARD H. PRUDEN, Washington, D. C.
J. C. WILKINSON, Athens, Georgia
SWAN HAYWORTH, Vicksburg, Miss.
WITHROW T. HOLLAND, Haynesville, La.
ADIEL J. MONCRIEF, St. Joseph, Mo.
BLAKE SMITH, Austin, Texas
HUBERT R. HOWARD, JR., Tulsa, Okla.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

LEE C. SHEPPARD, *Chairman*
FRED B. HELMS
CARL LEE OUSLEY
R. K. REDWINE
JOHN MCGINNIS
WARREN CARR
A. C. MCCALL
WILBUR W. HUTCHINS

CONTENTS

Editorials 75
Thus He Waits ..... Claude U. Broach .. 79
How Old Are the Baptist Churches? ..... R. E. E. Harkness .. 80
The Subconscious Underworld of Childhood .... S. L. Morgan, Sr. 86
Books 98
Correspondence 100
News 102

Christian Frontiers is published monthly (except July and August) by the Baptist Book Club, a non-profit fellowship of ministers and laymen. Address all correspondence to Box 508, Chapel Hill, North Carolina. Copyright 1946 by the Baptist Book Club. Entered as second class matter February 6, 1947 at the post office at Chapel Hill, N. C. under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription price, two dollars a year; twenty-five cents a copy. Printed by The Graphic Press, Inc., Raleigh, N.C.

Who's Who In This Issue

CLAUDE U. BROACH, who contributes a poem to this issue, is pastor of St. John's Baptist Church in Charlotte, and a graduate of the University of Georgia and the Baptist Theological Seminary.

R. E. E. HARKNESS is a resident of Chester, Pa., and editor of *The Chronicle,* a Baptist historical quarterly.

S. L. MORGAN, SR., a retired minister now living at Wake Forest, N. C., was also a contributor to former issues of this magazine.

HELMUT KUHN, who contributes the book review to this issue, is a professor in the Philosophy Department of the University of North Carolina and has his Ph.D. from the University of Breslau.

EDITORIALS

The South Must Feel Her Own Pulse

THE ANCIENT maxim, "know thyself," is a primary tenet of modern psychotherapy. Ingeniously and delicately the psychiatrist seeks to explain the patient to himself, to make him see for himself the basic motives, the defeated hopes, the secret fears, the lurking sins (without using the term) that lie behind his aberrations and confusions. Granted that the patient has a sincere desire for restoration and sufficient recuperative powers it is enough that with the help of another person or alone he take an honest look at himself. After a pretty thorough self-searching it is recorded of the prodigal in the foreign country that "when he came to his senses" (Moffatt) he resolved penitently to return home.

We live in a section of the nation which is more than America's economic problem No. 1. The problem of the southland is bigger and far more complex than low wages, poor health, inadequate housing, eroded farms. Ours is a psychological problem. We are victims of inherited delusions, traditional prejudices, inbred fanaticisms, and tragic oppression. The last cause is an indictment of a victorious North from Reconstruction days until this present day. More than anything else the South needs to explain herself to herself. And the physician must not be imported. Her own sons must rise up to play the physician and say to a sick southland, "Thou ailest here, and here!"

They must show us how the more economically insecure our whites are the more intense the racial animosities, how the poor exploited white man in order to preserve some shred of self respect takes it out on the negro to be sure that some one is a little lower in the scale than he. They must demonstrate how this wretched drive for self-assertion spawns the Ku Klux Klan, the Columbians and other fascist groups. Their diagnosis must open our eyes to the manner in which racism serves the interests of investors from other sections of the nation and has even been encouraged by such investors to hide from us the true cause of economic back-

wardness—colonialism. The other-worldliness of our churches must be brought up for scrutiny as well as the preaching which invests the status quo with sanctity and scriptural support. Along with this must come up the sin of our inordinate pride, pride that though defeated we were never conquered, pride in an illustrious South that ought never to have been, pride in an Anglo-Saxon homogeneity which still "balkanizes" us from the rest of the nation.

But the physician must do more than deal with a spiritual and psychical trauma. He must lead the patient to an appreciation of the patient's latent potentialities; he must point out, or rather have the patient discover for himself, his reservoir of natural resources in readiness for service. So the Dixie doctor must remind us of the vast resources of our children. If the psalmist is correct in his statement of a man's happiness whose quiver is full of children, then the South, the last booming children-production center of the nation, might be exultant. And here we have the best climate in the nation. Else why did the government erect the greater part of its military camps in the South? And here are the minerals and the forests and the resorts. And here is the greatest segment of un-naturalized American citizens, the Negro, ten million strong in the southern states, waiting as so much precious raw material to be processed and refined into the best of American citizenry. And scorn it as you may, ye sophisticated, referring to it as the Bible Belt, here too is a church-mindedness among both races, unparalleled elsewhere, that carries the seeds of a spiritual revolution.

So the South, explaining herself to herself, seeing the frustrations, inner repressions, guilt consciousness, artificial poverty, isolationism and regionalism, that throttle her sound health and progress, must also see the resources of healing, the *elan vital,* in the very genius of her people and land. And so she must forget the things which are behind and reach forward to a future of prosperity, spiritual leadership and cultural achievement exceeding the fondest hopes and dreams of Henry W. Grady.

W. W. F.

Fundamentalism and Labor Unionism

ARTICLES and editorials dealing with labor and the church in the South have appeared frequently in *Christian Frontiers*. Any question in the minds of our readers as to the need of this frequency may be dispelled by reading an editorial in the winter issue of *Prophetic Religion,* organ of the Fellowship of Southern Churchmen. Here a "blast of thirty retaliatory letters," mailed in reply to a recent reminder sent out by the FSC to 25,000 southern ministers that officially, at least in principle, trade unionism has the support of the denominations, is broken down into four groups. One might add that the groupings are along classical lines.

First, "the church should not pontificate on any labor or political question because Jesus said before Pilate, 'My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world then would my servants fight.' " In this group was offered the claim that the sole duty of the church was to teach people "to shun hell and win heaven." Second, it therefore follows that Christians should "come out from the world" (surely these were our Baptist brethren) and have no traffic with such organizations as trade unions especially since so many members are as yet unsaved. Here was tortured for further Biblical support Paul's warning, "Be not unequally yoked together with unbelievers." Third, the protest against the agitation and confusion brought in by labor unions which prevent the brethren from dwelling together in peace. Once again the authority of the apostle Paul was appealed to: "Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers," but the appellant did not specify whether the "higher powers" might be the N.A.M. or something else. Wrote one indignant pastor plaintively, "I think the South was doing pretty well by itself until northern labor interests took a hand. . . . Since then I have seen no peace here." Rather similar to the full-blooded southerner's remark we often hear, "What negro problem? We don't have no negro problem if you'd let us alone." And fourth, there was the complaint the labor leaders are un-Christian and immoral, employing methods that no Christian can follow. One less impulsive pastor suggested

that he would cooperate if and when labor became more "idealistic."

We agree with *Prophetic Religion* that these letters of refutation are important "because they are indicative of an appalling ignorance, religious bibliolatry and twisted idealism which today shackle many southern ministers and which through their words and deeds bind the congregations to their own state of backwardness." As to the ignorance of the realities of labor we deplore the prejudicial information reaching our ministers through the newspapers and radio and shudder not to recommend to their reading along with this distinguished Baptist journal such publications (saints preserve us) as *PM,* the *Nation,* and *The New Republic.* As to bibliolatry and "twisted idealism," well, this is a long story. Biblical literalism goes hand in glove with economic determinism and exploitation. Suffice it here to say that we indict our colleges and seminaries for their timidity or want of social vision or both in failing to equip our ministry with a solid concern for and a sound understanding of the fundamental realities of economic justice and opportunity.

W. W. F.

A Pressure Group to End Pressure Groups

THERE IS as much truth as jibe in the remark that what we have in Washington is "government by pressure groups." No person or cause can hope for recognition or consideration apart from a bloc or lobby or pressure group. Hence the silver bloc, the cotton bloc, the labor union, the N.A.M., the oil lobby, the real estate associations, the whiskey interests, race pressure groups, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, etc. Writing in the January 20 issue of *Christianity and Crisis,* Dr. Henry P. Van Dusen complains that "methods to secure minority ends against majority weal, originally developed by organized business and finance, are now employed by every segment of the population with limited and particular interests—labor, farmers, races. . . . The ominous fact is: the bedrock of American democracy, vaguely yet adequately identified as the middle and pro-

fessional classes, is rapidly losing effective voice in the affairs of state." Dr. Van Dusen goes on to advocate something new under the sun of American political science, a huge, over-all organization of this middle class for the benefit of all and for the protection of all. "It might bear the simple title "CITIZENS INCORPORATED." It would be committed to a single principle—the interest of the whole people above the interest of any segment. It would espouse a single objective—insistence upon the general welfare against every threat from a special and limited dictation." And here comes the most interesting phase of the idea for us: since the greater part of our American churches draw their strength from the middle and professional classes and since this last "pressure group" must be composed of these people, "it is the legitimate role of the churches, indeed an inescapable responsibility, to bring their constituencies to intelligent understanding of this issue which lies at the root of most of our domestic maladies, and of the dimensions of the peril. In the long view, the survival of American democracy in the troublous decades ahead may hang on a resolution of this problem."

W. W. F.

Thus He Waits

As the sower waits for harvest,
As the parched earth waits for rain,
As the open furrow waits for seed,
As the lover waits for an answer,
So God waits for our willingness
As He dreams of a world at peace.

—Claude U. Broach

How Old Are the Baptist Churches

R. E. E. HARKNESS

ONE THING of which we must be careful in this study is not to confuse the history of Baptists with the history of the principles upon which as a religious group they are founded. They are not identical.

We may profitably ask ourselves, as an illustration, how old are the principles upon which the Democratic party in the United States was formed? Certainly they are older than the nation itself and may be said to be the political principles upon which the Republic was established. But the Democratic party, as an organized body, had its origin much later. The national period of our country's history began in 1787-89 with the adoption of the Constitution while historians place the birth of the party, as we know it today, as late as 1828-29.

So it is with the history of the Baptists. The principles which they have stressed, the doctrines they have believed and taught, the faith to which they have held through suffering and death, the church order they have adopted, their policy and practice have their roots in the inspired utterances of the prophets of the Old Testament and in the teachings of John the Baptist of the New. But especially are they founded in the messages of Jesus Christ to men and in the gospel proclaimed by the apostles.

There can be no doubt or denial of that fact.

But the Baptists as a distinct Christian organization, as a sect or denomination, did not have their origins in those periods of history. It is true that down through the centuries to the Reformation and much later, even to the present, there have been Christian bodies who held and hold to all or some of these principles but they were and are not Baptists either in name or in reality. In all that time, particularly, though not solely, down to the Reformation, groups who held these doctrines and observed these practices we call Baptist, either also taught other doctrines and forms of polity which Baptists have in general rejected as repugnant to them, or they have neglected as being indifferent and unnecessary certain views and practices which Baptists have insisted are essential in a true church of Christ.

For instance, the Greek Orthodox Church has always observed immersion as the New Testament form of baptism. But is does so by infant baptism. The Petrobrusians of the twelfth century taught, it is true, that the Scriptures are the only rule of faith and practice and that only believers in Christ should be baptized. But there is no proof whatever that the rite was performed by immersion—all evidence pointing rather to affusion. Moreover, they believed that church edifices should not be erected for purposes of worship. We can scarcely call these people Baptists.

In this same century Peter Waldo taught similar views. While, however, some of his followers rejected infant baptism and all the sacraments, others believed in transubstantiation, priests, and bishops.

Later the Anabaptists, especially the disciples of Menno Simons in Holland, rejected infant baptism, taught the priesthood of believers, affirmed that Scripture is the sole guide and authority of the Christian (the latter two of which, as a matter of fact, Luther also taught) but few of them baptized by immersion, nor do they to this day. Quite different from Baptists, they refused to take the oath or bear arms and some to hold civil office. Certain of these Anabaptists and Mennonites continue to this day entirely distinct from the Baptists in any part of the world.

The Baptists, as a sect, an organized body of Christian believers, had their origin in 1608. There is no reference to them in any literature before that date. The name does not appear prior to it, nor do they themselves at that time ever lay claim to having had an earlier origin.

The story of their beginnings, substantiated by undeniable historical sources, is as follows:

The English Parliament in 1534 by the Act of Supremacy rejected the papal claim to the headship of the national church and enacted that "the King . . . shall be taken, accepted and reputed the only supreme head on earth of the Church of England." There was, however, little change otherwise, Henry VIII declaring that the Church varied not in one jot or tittle from the faith Catholic.

This was not sufficient for those English Christians, who, having been exiled to Geneva in the reign of Roman Catholic

Mary (1553-58), were influenced by John Calvin and urged larger reforms when they returned to England upon the ascension of Elizabeth to the throne. These were the Puritans to whom an established church was acceptable but who wished to purge the English church of some of its Roman ceremonies and observances.

Others went farther still insisting that the New Testament church was a free church, separate from the State with the right to manage its own affairs and determine voluntarily its own form of worship. These extremists of that day, thus denying the authority both of State and Church, were severely persecuted in the closing years of the sixteenth and the opening years of the seventeenth centuries. A number of groups were forced into exile to Holland as early as 1581.

One such church at Gainsborough near Norwich in Norfolk county, under the ministry of Rev. John Smyth, was driven into banishment in 1606, settling at Amsterdam, Holland. A sister church from nearby Scrooby emigrated in 1607-08 under the leadership Rev. John Robinson. These people took up their abode at Leyden, Holland, from whom came the Pilgrim Fathers of Plymouth Rock. The former group became Baptists.

John Smyth was ever a man who sought the truth, yearning to know the will of God and the mind and spirit of Christ. He passed through Anglicanism, in which establishment he had been ordained, into Puritanism and thence into the Separatist position. Accordingly he believed in a free church composed of regenerated persons, by their faith in the atonement of Christ, who voluntarily covenanted together to effect such an organization, the church. He and his followers affirmed the sole Headship of Jesus Christ in the church, the priesthood of the believer, the Scriptures as the only rule of faith and practice for the disciple.

But, as other Separatists, they still believed in and observed the rite of infant baptism as a New Testament ordinance.

Thrown into close fellowship with the Mennonites in Amsterdam they were led in 1608 by these faithful Christians to the true light, rejecting infant baptism and administering baptism only upon those who made a sincere profession of

faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as Saviour. Smyth, according to all historical evidence, baptized himself by affusion and then baptized, in a similar way, some 41 others who had allied themselves with him in this new church of the New Testament pattern. Thus was the first *Baptist* church organized.

Smyth in the process of time came to feel that his self-baptism did not have Scriptural warrant and he therefore considered uniting with the Mennonites in order that he might receive baptism from them which seemed to him to be more in accord with the New Testament records because they were already an established church. If he and his associates were organizing a church *de novo* it might be proper for them to proceed as they had, but since there was a duly organized Christian church (the Mennonite) at hand from whose ordained minister he might receive the ordinance he felt convinced he should join with them.

Many of his members, however, led by Thomas Helwys and John Murton opposed this move, first of all declaring that there were a number of Mennonite doctrines with which they did not and could not agree and, secondly, asserting that as they had New Testament authority for organizing their church they certainly had the same authority to baptize themselves. If two or three believers in Christ voluntarily form a church, withouth reference to or sufferance of pope or bishop, or any other earthly authority, then it followed certainly that such believers had the prior right to administer their own baptism.

Smyth died in August 1612 and in the same year the majority of the English Christian people returned home under the leadership of Thomas Helwys and John Murton to establish the first Baptist churches in London and its vicinity. Helwys declared that if they truly believed what they professed and were loyal to Christ they should not seek security from persecution but should bear witness to their faith whatever the price they might be called upon to pay. Soon after returning to their native land Helwys suffered imprisonment from which, evidently, he never found release.

In 1612 he published a book entitled *The Mistery of Iniquity* a copy of which he presented to King James I, who claimed he ruled by divine right. The dedication reads in part:

"Heare O King, and dispise not the counsell of the poore, and let their complaints come before thee.

The King is a mortall man, and not God therefore hath no power over the immortall soules of his subjects, to make lawes and ordinances for them, and to set spiritual Lords over them.

If the king have authority to make spiritual Lords and Lawes, then he is an immortall God, and not a mortall man.

O King be not seduced by deceivers to sin against God whome thou oughtest to obey, nor against thy poore subjects who ought and will obey thee in all things with body, life and goods, or else let their lives be taken from the earth.

God save the King."

In the body of his book he thus writes to this autocratic king:

"Our lord the King is but an earthly King, and he hath no aucthority as a King but in earthly causes, and if the Kings people be obedient and true subjects, obeying all humane lawes made by the King, our lord the King can require no more; for mens religion to God is betwixt God and themselves; the King shall not answere for it, neither may the King be judg betweene God and man. Let them be heretikes, Turcks, Jewes or whatever, it apperteynes not to the earthly power to punish them in the least measure."

These were known as the General Baptists because having been in Holland they adopted the Arminian theology the chief tenet of which is that the atonement of Jesus was provided for the salvation of all men who would freely partake thereof through faith in Christ. John Smyth signed a Confession of Faith containing 20 articles written in Latin but never printed. Later he and 41 others signed one of 38 articles. After Smyth's death in 1612 and before 1614 some of his associates published another statement. Many others appeared but the Declaration of 1660 definitely refutes the charge that they are "Ana-Baptists" and is the first to prescribe immersion as the New Testament form of baptism.

In 1633 a slightly different order of Baptists arose. Rev. Henry Jacob, who had been pastor of an Independent Puritan church composed of English people in Holland, returned to England in 1616 with a church at Southwark near old London. With this congregation were many members who held scruples regarding infant baptism. In 1633 some of these withdrew from the parent body and formed a church adopt-

ing baptism upon profession of faith in Christ. This was the beginning of the Particular Baptists, so called because they were Calvinists believing in a limited atonement of the elect only. They too drew up their Confessions of Faith, their first in 1644 stating that their churches were "commonly (though falsely) called Anabaptists."

These Confessions, whether of the General or the Particular Baptists were not creeds requiring the signature of those who might desire membership in the churches. The introduction or preface to the 1651 General Confession reads:

> "Published (in love) by consent of two from each Congregation, appointed for that purpose. 1. To inform those who have a desire to know what Religious Duties they hold forth. 2. To undeceive those that are mis-informed thereof. 3. To the end that the said Congregations may in love, and the spirit of Meekness, be informed by any that conceive they walk amiss."

The preface to the first Confession of the Particular Baptists (1644) is as follows:

> Presented to the view of all that feare God, to examine by the touchstone of the Word of Truth; As likewise for the taking off those aspersions which are frequently both in Pulpit and Print, (although unjustly) cast upon them.

Baptists, then, are the Protestants of the Protestants. They suffered persecution from Protestants as well as Roman Catholics. But they held firmly and loyally to their convictions that their doctrines and principles were those proclaimed by Jesus and the apostles. Their churches in outward form necessarily differed from those of primitive Christians but in spirit and in truth they were in true accord with them.

Baptists need not seek their own honor and glory, nor the eternal verities of their teaching and polity, in their allegiance to some great historic character as their founder; no matter how exalted that man may be, their glory and their authority is to be found in their constant obedience and loyalty to Jesus Christ as the supreme Lord of conscience and conduct, and in their own world-wide achievements for the salvation of men throughout the centuries in His name and for His sake.

Thomas Crosby, *The History of the English Baptists,* London, 1738
Joseph Ivimey, *A History of the English Baptists,* London, 1811
Adam Taylor, *A History of the English General Baptists,* London, 1818
John Smyth's own writings and numerous other sources.

The Subconscious Underworld of Childhood

S. L. MORGAN, SR.

NOW FOR HALF a century many of the best minds of the world have been probing deep into child nature and child psychology. The result is a profound understanding of the mind and soul of a child beyond that of any previous generation. And out of this wealth of understanding one momentous conclusion emerges with startling distinctness. It is that distorted ideas, morbid fears, conflicting concepts lodged in the mind of a little child may remain hidden away in the subconscious to warp and blight the entire life, and even result in wrecking one's religious faith, sometimes even causing an emotional or physical breakdown after many years.

Among such ruinous ideas in the mind of a child are ideas that sex desire is wicked or dirty, that ghosts or demons are watching it, that God is vengeful and harsh, punishing without mercy, or sending sickness, death, or calamity as a judgment for sin. To safeguard childhood against such ruinous ideas has been a leading motive behind all the modern crusade for the wiser training of children. It has brought a short conflict between the old and the new schools of thought in regard to the child; the old holding on to the view that the child is simply a sinner, and conversion its only remedy; the new school adding that, not only sin in the blood stream, but ruinous ideas lodged in the subconscious of the child, perhaps by unwise parents or teachers, may put a twist in the character or doom the life after many years.

Underworld of Childhood

The new sciences of psychology and psychiatry have uncovered to us an underworld of tragedy hardly less dismal and awesome than the underworld uncovered in Dante's *Inferno,* where the damned suffer endless torture. This is the underworld in the subconscious of childhood, where all manner of fears and ugly, distorted ideas have been planted, setting up conflicts, ripening into complexes, often hardening into neuroses and character twists, frequently destined to

blight the personality and doom the life to suffering and failure. There is imperative need for parents, teachers, preachers, social workers, and all others that have to do with children, to know at least the surface facts about this underworld. A vast literature has been built up in this field, and ignorance is almost inexcusable. It seems particularly so for the educated minister.

The list of such childhood tragedies would be endless, the causes innumerable. A noted minister, who had served churches on both sides of the Atlantic, and then for a decade or so wrote a daily syndicated article read by millions, and who meanwhile had received letters by tens of thousands from people who opened to him the dark closets of their lives and exposed the skeletons, wrote impressively of this underworld as follows:

"It was amazing to me to learn how many people go limping through life, crippled souls, owing to some hurt or humiliation, some injustice or cruelty suffered in childhood . . . starved souls, of people looking for something lost, of stabbing hurts and devastating frustrations. . . . How often, when one of the primary instincts is thwarted or bruised, it may mar a whole lifetime." [1]

Childhood Case Histories

Here are several instances out of the common everyday life of childhood. Dr. J. S. Bonnell, noted New York minister, lately named as Dr. Fosdick's successor as coast-to-coast radio preacher, gives this in *Pastoral Psychiatry*. [2] A boy of ten, whose father never had any time for him. The sisters were loved and petted and praised; he was never appreciated nor praised ,but ridiculed and scolded. He grew resentful and rebellious, he domineered over his sisters, and was insolent to his parents and teachers. Made to feel inferior at home, he blustered and stormed to gain attention, and became a nuisance and failure at school. He began to feel he was an outcast at home, a pariah at school and on the street. He grew desperate—"what's the use to try?" Unloved, a nobody,

[1] Joseph Fort Newton, *River of Years*
[2] Bonnell, *Pastoral Psychiatry*

why not do something daring—even a crime, to get talked about? So criminals are made, and he was headed towards crime, driven by a soul-wound.

Dr. Bonnell got next to him, the lad's heart open to anyone that cared. He went to the parents: "Harold is starving for your love and appreciation. You praise his sisters, but not him. Love him, praise him, give him some of your time, and you'll be proud of him." They began anew. The busy father gave him hours a week, taking him to his room and treating him as a guest. The boy was soon made over. It was a case of "a stabbing hurt" to a child, liable to doom him to ruin, and the cause not suspected by the parents.

Childhood fears often bring devastating results through life. A childhood fright lodged in the subconscious may prove ruinous. Dr. E. R. Groves in *Wholesome Childhood* tells of a boy of ten who had never spoken a word. His vocal organs were found normal. A psychiatrist probed into his past; his cultured father had often whipped him as a tiny child for trifles, like crying when he wanted to sleep. Fear had prevented his trying to talk. The specialist forbade the father to see him for some months. Removed from fear of his father, the child gradually learned to talk, and was able to enter school at ten years of age.

The same author in his *Personality and Social Development* tells of a boy of five years who was left several days by his parents with the housekeeper. For a supposed misdeed she shut him up in the attic for three days on bread and water as punishment till he confessed. After twenty-five years she wrote him she learned he was innocent. At the age of 60, sick and delirious, he begged to be taken to the attic where fifty-five years before he had been imprisoned. He sat on a chest weeping, and sobbed out, "Three days, nobody came; I listened and listened. Alone! Nobody came!"

A mature young woman consulted Dr. Leslie Weatherhead, London minister and psychologist. She said, "For many years I've lived a horrible life, unable to sleep alone, a prey to frightful nightmares and sleep-walking. Sometimes I've considered suicide." She had dropped a clue that led him to suspect a sex fright in childhood. So he said, "Can you recall any fright you had as a child?" She said, "No;—oh,

yes, I hadn't thought of it for years. As a little girl I had a dreadful fright—from a man." She had pushed it down into the subconscious trying to forget it. There it had set up a complex, almost driving her to suicide. He brought it out in the open for her to look at as something not now to be feared, and said, "Clearly that is the cause of your neurosis and your nightmares. Otherwise you evidently are well." She wrote him later, and then some months later still, and said, "Seeing it all came from a childhood fright, and facing it in the open, my horrible affliction has almost disappeared after years of torture almost to suicide."

These are but samples of the endless variety of suffering coming from ugly things planted in the subconscious of childhood. We now turn to the religious aspect of the subject, and consider the suffering and lifelong injury that may come from lodging in the minds of children ideas of God as harsh and vengeful, as angry with the sinner and damning him to hell.

Hurtful Religious Teaching

On this subject Dorothy F. Wilson writes a very illuminating chapter in her *Child Psychology and Religious Education,*[3] where she discusses the child's fears and his ideas of God. She says there can be no doubt that in the last century fear had far too large a place in theology and preaching. Jonathan Edwards held his congregation dangling over the pit of hell as he vehemently painted its horrors and the doom of sinners, till they clung to the benches for fear of immediately sinking into hell. After hearing him a little girl of four years was heard crying, in dreadful fear that God would not forgive her sins and would send her to hell. It is but a sample of the suffering of childhood induced by fear of a God of wrath who is angry with sinners and dooms them to hell. Children were kept in awe of God pictured as a Judge in the sky, his eye ever watching the child to write down in a book every evil deed and word. One told how his teacher constantly dwelt on this All-seeing, Unseen eye, ever watching, at night the moon and stars helping him to see the better,

[3] Chapter IV

until late in life he said, "For many years I disliked the stars exceedingly."

The author quotes as a sample of the hymns for children this stanza from a book of children's hymns published in 1852:

"There is a dreadful hell
And everlasting pains;
There sinners must with devils dwell,
In darkness, fire, and chains."

She concludes that such pictures of hell and such dreadful ideas of God, held before children even in evangelistic meetings down to recent times must have caused "terrible and widespread suffering" among children and even neurotic troubles, and must have destroyed "all possibility of the child's love for God," and often left the whole life soured and embittered.

The writer was preaching several days in a rural church years ago. It was the custom to invite penitents to the front in making a profession of faith. A little girl of 12, phenomenally bright, was in great distress, weeping under a sense of her sins. Repeatedly for two days she made the rounds among her friends in the congregation, weeping in agony and appealing for help. "I am such a sinner; can't you help me?" After two days the burden lifted. It seemed certain that parents and teachers and friends had passed down to her the older doctrine of a God cruel and vengeful, "angry with the wicked every day" (Ps. 7:11), and dooming even children to a hell of fire.

J. G. McKenzie, Scotch social scientist and psychologist, in his *Psychology, Psychotherapy and Evangelicalism,* maintains that Starbuck, and Williams James in his *Varieties of Religious Experience,* neglect to give more than scant notice to what has preceded the conversion of children. They confine their attention to the dramatic moments of conflict immediately before and during conversion. "To chop off one particular experience as though it had little or no relation to the whole past religious life of the individual is fallacious." What went on in the early years of childhood usually determines even the type of one's conversion. Yet Starbuck and James almost pass by the numerous cases where the religious life from the early years has been but a gradual unfolding, with

no sudden or explosive conversion. Some like E. Stanley Jones estimates that this mild, gradual type of conversion is 60 per cent of the total. And so, if we trace back the stream of religious experience far enough, we discover usually that what James calls the "varieties of religious experience" were already present in early childhood.

McKenzie continues, "Unfortunately, too many children's early experience of religion is colored by ideas of God which tend to arouse fear if they do anything wrong. Often this results in behavior which leads to neurotic habits." He gives an instance. He was asked to see a little girl of 10 or 11 who said she could not go to sleep because of "thoughts that will not go away." At last he drew from her what sort of thoughts they were. Timidly she said, "My mind keeps saying, 'Damn God, Damn God!' " [4]

The psychologist's explanation was that she had been taught that God would be angry if she expressed her normal desires in certain ways that seemed to her innocent, and fear of God blocked the way for such expression, and so her heart burst the barrier set up by God and cried out bitterly, "Damn God!" Often, he says, such fear in children under a sense of guilt drives them to all manner of self-punishment, like going to school without breakfast, washing the hands often, bowing to every church they pass and saying a prayer. [5]

It is hardly open to doubt that the revolt in recent years against wildcat, hellfire evangelism arose largely out of a growing conviction among the more intelligent of the community that revivals making much of such distorted ideas of God and his wrath against the sinner, did much positive injury to the child. Such revolt was felt acutely in one revival in the memory of the writer. A leading evangelist of one of the largest denominations in a warehouse meeting daily rang the changes on the gruesome phrase, "fry in hell," repeated often with hypnotic effect even before the altar where little children knelt, apparently aimed at frightening children into confessing and foresaking their sins. It proved the evangelist's own undoing. The intelligent crowd revolted,

[4] McKenzie, *Psychology, Psychotherapy and Evangelicalism*, pp. 46-50

[5] McKenzie, p. 49

and the expected thousands became a handful after a few days. It is significant of the more intelligent understanding of child nature, and the new crusade to protect it.

American Pioneer in Child Psychology

Professor C. P. Oberndorf, Columbia University psychiatrist, has a recent book, *The Psychiatric Novels of Oliver Wendell Holmes,* which is a significant contribution to the literature on child nature. He rates Dr. Holmes among the greatest doctors in the world of his day, and a pioneer in the mental phenomena and diseases of childhood, anticipating Freud by some years. Dr. Holmes wrote three novels, *Elsie Venner, A Guardian Angel,* and *A Mortal Antipathy,* of no great literary merit, but with a deep religious objective. Unable to attack openly the hellfire preaching of his day, Dr. Holmes shrewdly aimed at getting over in fiction his own life-long, vehement protest felt against the "damnation theology" preached by his own father and other New England ministers of his day. All his life Dr. Holmes believed such preaching gave a view of God and hellfire punishment that blighted and crippled childhood and was a slander on the nature of God. All the profound study of childhood in recent years in the main confirms Dr. Holmes's teaching.

In each of the three novels, condensed in the volume named, the hero received some inherited trait, or some shock in early childhood, that foredooms it to years of suffering. This idea is presented most vividly in *A Mortal Antipathy,* written late in Holmes's life, most of his medical study behind him. His theory is suggested in an incident told in the preface. A mature man declared that he could never pass a tall clock in the hall without a feeling of terror. It was due to a fright when an infant in arms. A heavy clock weight had fallen with a crash and frightened him badly. He never got over it. It was likely Holmes's own experience.

This idea is made the thesis of *A Mortal Antipathy.* The hero of the story is Maurice Kirkwood. At the age of two his cousin seized him from his nurse's arms and was tossing him up. Badly frightened, he sprang from her and fell from the second story balcony into a thorn bush, and the thorns tore him badly. His cousin was a beautiful girl of 17. Never

afterwards could he look at a young woman without terror and becoming deathly pale. Repeatedly he fainted away at sight of one. He had to be educated in a boys' school, always till he was a mature man living a hermit life, in terror of seeing a young woman. His cure came when, helpless from long illness, the house on fire, he wakes to find he has been carried to safety by a young woman on whom he opens his eyes, and feels the surge of gratitude and love.

In *A Guardian Angel* the heroine, when a motherless child of two years, is cruelly kept in an attic for 18 hours by her guardians in a fruitless effort to break her will. Again in the attic at ten years, she is dreadfully frightened by putting her hand on the cold hand of her uncle—hanging dead. Meanwhile her soul through the years froze in the atmosphere of the Puritanic religion of the home, majoring on the fear of hell. Finally she sprang up in the midst of the worship hour, refusing to join in singing a hymn about the terrors of hell. She dashed out and away, heedless of the screams of her guardians. Repressed and starved for love, she was redeemed through the love of a young man.

The Columbia psychiatrist, author of the recent book, assures us that Dr. Holmes's theories, if far ahead of his time, accord to a remarkable degree with the findings of present-day mental science.

Injury From Old Testment "Bad Stories"

In increasing numbers intelligent parents and teachers revolt against lodging in the child mind stories representing God as a monster of vengeance and cruelty. The conviction deepens that only harm can come from planting in the child mind the composite picture of God as given in such stories as these, if interpreted literally: that God "hardened Pharaoh's heart" and then in one night killed the firstborn of man and beast in every Egyptian family—*because* Pharaoh's heart was hard; that God advised deception when it would be risky to tell the truth (1 Sam. 16:1-5); that he ordered a man stoned to death for no greater offense than "gathering sticks" on the Sabbath to build a fire (Num. 15:32-36); that he ordered the merciless slaughter of captive "infants and sucklings"

(1 Sam. 15:3); that he "sent" a pestilence and killed 70,000 because David took a census (2 Sam. 24:15).

It seems no wonder that Studdert-Kennedy, famous chaplain of World War I, calls it "blasphemous" [6] to give children such an idea of God as is conveyed by a literal interpretation of such stories. Intelligent parents in increasing numbers protest against teaching such an idea of God to their children, sometimes declaring, "I will take my child from Sunday School rather than have him taught such an idea of God!"

Hardly less blighting to the soul of a child is the persistent Old Testament idea that God in wrath "smote" with sickness, pestilence, and death those that displeased him. This doctrine was losing its hold on the Hebrew people by later Old Testament times, and it was expressly rejected by Jesus. The affliction of the man born blind was not due to anyone's sin, he said (John 9:3). Nor was it a punishment sent for sin when 18 were killed by the falling tower of Siloam nor when Jewish worshipers were slaughtered by Pilate (Lk. 13:1-5). Child psychology today gives convincing evidence that this idea of a God smiting in anger with sickness, calamity, and death often hardens in the child into a character resentful, rebellious, and bitter, not infrequently resulting even in the loss of all faith in the Bible that seems to teach it and in the church that sponsors the teaching. The literature of childhood is replete with cases of life-long scepticism and bitterness traceable to this idea of a harsh, vengeful God, striking down loved ones with sickness, death, and disaster. Job was written to prove that the good are afflicted as well as the bad; but in general the language of the old Testament seems to justify the belief so prevalent, "God struck the blow, God took the dear one." And too often one cries in bitterness, "I hate God for it!" Over and over such cases have come under the eye of the writer.

Case 1. A handsome, brilliant young father. Slowly and with agony the story came: "A child was to be born, and I prayed, if it pleased God, that it might be a boy and a minister. The boy was born—a hopeless imbecile! I grew up on the traditional Bible doctrine of providence, that when sickness, calamity, or death come, God "sent" it. I had been teacher

[6] *The Hardest Part,* p. 55

of a big men's class; I led prayer meetings; I made important addresses. The blow was too much. The Bible seemed to teach all that—and I threw the Bible overboard. Clearly that seemed to be the God of the Bible—and I hated him! And so I went on for years: no Bible, no God, no religion; rebellious, bitter, my back turned on the church. Slowly, after years, it began to dawn on me that this was but the God of the early Old Testament, not the God and Father of Jesus Christ. And this was not the Bible; it was the dim belief of the early Old Testament."

Case 2. One of the most devoted, active Christian couples, pillars in their church for years. Then came the war, and within weeks both their sons killed. Till past midnight the story poured out, black, hopeless, bitter. The Old Testament idea held the center: "God did it, he struck the blow." Faith in ruins, would the mind snap, the body succumb to the strain? But they had the saving memory of a real religious experience, and will likely find their way back through the blackness—and even be the finer for it.

But that is the peril—and the cruelty—of such an idea of God planted long ago in the mind of the child. Hidden in the subconscious, it builds up there through the years a conflict, the harsh Old Testament idea of God against the tender idea given by Jesus, God a Father pitiful even for the sparrow. The conflict never resolved, one lacks a settled faith equal to meeting a crisis. And so the shaky structure built up round a conflict tumbles when some great crisis comes. And sometimes in the blackness of such a crisis one who is a Christian at heart drifts from the uncertain mooring and is heard to cry in the bitterness of rebellion, "Damn the Bible! Damn God!" And so Studdert-Kennedy, facing the picture of the God of cruel acts and commands in the early Old Testament, cries bitterly, "If God is like that, I hate him, and I am a better man for hating him." [7]

The case histories compiled by modern psychiatry and psychoanalysis, even such books as those named above, offer abundant documented evidence showing the lifelong harm that may come from lodging in the minds of little children

[7] Studdert-Kennedy, *The Hardest Part,* p. 36

wrong or distorted ideas of God, punishing cruelly here or hereafter, watching to record every wrong act or word; and the church in this "century of the child" dare not remain ignorant nor indifferent to this vast array of evidence.

The Church Meeting the Challenge

In the light of so much evidence of injury to the child from such distorted teaching, the church and its leaders no longer dare to subject the children under its auspices to such teaching, no matter how sincere the teachers who interpret the Old Testament literally. The sincerity of such teachers is indeed one of the real obstacles. Wise parents, understanding the principles of progressive revelation, will not permit such teaching of their children to go unchallenged. One little girl went home from the primary department to say to her mother, "I don't believe God told Abraham to kill his son and burn him on an altar!" Happy mother of such a child; happy child of such a mother! Together they had grasped the principle of progressive revelation, that all the Old Testament is to be interpreted by the teaching of Christ. That, in the words of H. H. Rowley, "By Him the truth of the Old Testament is to be tested, and He gives the measure of its inspiration." [8]

The pastor has a grave responsibility for the child, and so has the seminary that prepared him. So has the Sunday School council. Where the pastor and a few leading officials are committed to the principle of progressive revelation, gradually the entire Sunday School council can be brought to accept and teach the principle. Sympathy and tact are essential. A well-trained assistant in a certain primary department ventured to remonstrate on hearing the God of the Old Testament held before the children as unethical and cruel. "Why teach such ideas of God," she asked; "they will have to unlearn it later." The reformer's effort was received coolly, and she was squelched. Such efforts in behalf of sounder teaching deserve the support of the pastor and other leaders. Headway may have to be made slowly and with sympathy for those who still accept all the Bible as "meaning exactly

[8] Rowley, *The Relevance of the Bible*, p. 50

what it says." The problem and the pathos of the present situation in the average church is that the literalists hold the initiative, and dare to hold up those who accept the principle of progressive revelation as heretics, "destroying the Bible." The aim should be for the latter group gradually, gently to win—not to *seize*—the initiative, and so establish the principle of progressive revelation wherever the Bible is taught in the church.

If it is true that the child is harmed by teaching it to interpret literally the Old Testament passages that represent God as doing and commanding unethical or cruel things, then the church dare not remain passive to such teaching. The warning of Jesus is pertinent here also, that it is preferable to end life in the ocean depths with a millstone round the neck than to lodge such ideas in the child mind—or to permit it under church auspices. Hardly anything is more harmful to a child than to lodge in its mind wrong ideas of God. Joseph Fort Newton tells of going to his wise mother, disturbed about what his church taught about God as vengeful and cruel. He said, "If Jesus is right, the church is wrong; and if one is wrong about God, he cannot be right about anything else, or very little." Earnestly she said, "Son, listen only to Jesus. Accept what he says about God . . . nothing else, nothing less; test everything by Him—forget the rest." [9] It was Jesus' own master key to Old Testament interpretation.

To establish this principle firmly must be the zealous objective for every church. "The times of ignorance God winked at;" but ignorance of the danger from any other principle of interpretation is no longer excusable. Half a century of profound study of child nature and child psychology has been put in our hands. Sincerity is not sufficient.

---

[9] Joseph Fort Newton, *River of Years*

BOOKS

I Chose Freedom. The Personal and Political Life of a Soviet Official. Victor Kravchenko. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946. 496 pages. $3.50

In April 1946 a member of the Soviet Purchasing Commission in Washington created a sensation by resigning from his position and issuing a communique in which he denounced Soviet policy. An apostate from Stalinist faith seeking shelter in democratic publicity—this was a novelty. In the book before us the apostate relates the story of his life, with his escape from totalitarian tutelage into American freedom as a final climax. It would be a pity if this unique biographical account should be forgotten along with the incident which helped it gain an ephemeral notoriety. The book deserves to be read through more than one season and it is recommended for close examination to all who are interested in knowing what is in store for us in the one world to come, should this one world be of the totalitarian variety.

Mr. Kravchenko's story is worth the telling, and he knows how to tell it. He came from a Russian working class family whose style of existence, in spite of czarist oppression, has been what we would describe as lower middle class rather than proletarian. His father, idealist and revolutionist (the two words seem synonyms in Russia), fought for freedom and suffered imprisonment. Still a boy Victor Kravchenko lived through the revolution, enlisted in the red army, worked as a miner, was sent to an engineering school and later joined the party. Almost miraculously he survived the two great purges and rose to a leading position in Russian metallurgist industry. His career culminated in his appointment to membership in the supply department of the government during the war. The narrative, following this ascent, takes us into the Kremlin and the immediate vicinity of the secluded inner circle round Joseph Stalin.

The writer, through many years a member of the Soviet elite, has been in an excellent position to observe the development of Russia under Stalin, especially of the Soviet industrial and bureaucratic apparatus. What he records about the general character of this development should perhaps not be new to the student of contemporary Russia. In point of fact, however, the impartial study of Russia has lately been discouraged among us, partly by the course of events, partly by interested parties. During the war we naturally liked to think of Russia as the gallant ally, and we did not stop to ask whether it was love of their regime or love of their country which inspired the Russian people in their heroic fight. We forgot, or tried to forget, the extermination of the kulaks as a class, the horrors of agrarian collectivization with a man-made famine in its wake, the mass murders during the

purges, the mass deportations to Siberian death camps, and the army of political slave laborers. The recollection of the Moscow trials of 1938 with their cynical degradation of the sanctity of law was tabu. But even those who are familiar with the general facts will find in Kravchenko an unparalleled vividness of narrative and dramatic evocation which instructs and entertains at the same time. Since keeping a diary must have been out of the question for reasons of safety we must credit the writer with an almost preternatural memory. Scenes and conversations which took place many years ago he seems to remember with a photographic wealth and precision of detail.

The reader is not to expect a tale of sheer horror. He will rather be overawed by the spectacle of a colossal constructive effort which beggars the performances of a Hitler, let alone Mussolini. The writer admits that the men round Stalin are competent administrators. and animated by a single-minded devotion to their task. But this constructive enterprise is carried on with enormous blundering, inconceivable waste, with diabolic brutality and a cynical disregard for human life and human freedom. The chief instrument of Soviet statecraft is the NKVD, with its net-work of agents the all-seeing eye of the omnipotent state. And this is clearly bent on swallowing up the earth by liberating people after people from the capitalist yoke.

The unfolding of the external drama is parallelled by an internal drama—the history of Victor Kravchenko's defection. Here we may discover a weakness in the report. What the author opposes to the terrifying reality of the communist regime is neither Christian faith nor a liberal political philosophy. In taking his stand he is prompted only by a sense of decency and his innate love of freedom. The word "only" is written with misgivings. It is true, decency and love of freedom are "only" a beginning in the sense that both moral growth and political action need for their development a broader basis than the one furnished by these two elementary conditions. But it is true that without them there can neither civilization nor Christianity. Mr. Kravchenko's book reminds us of the threatened foundations of the civilized world.

The writer implies or suggests answers to the main questions which Communist Russia poses to its contemporaries. One of these questions concerns the Orthodox Church whose re-establishment during the war has been hailed by Christian leaders in this country as a turning-point in Russian history and an important step towards the reunion of East and West. Forming a reliable opinion is difficult because the "iron curtain" prevents us from obtaining first-hand knowledge. And obscurity is made more obscure by the first-hand igorance with which beneficiaries of Stalin's selective hospitality generally return from their well-planned sightseeing trips.

So I quote without comment this passage which has a bearing on this problem, leaving it to the reader to dismiss it, if he so decides, as phantasms of a disgruntled fool or inventions of a fascist agent.

The chosen quotation renders a scene of the time immediately after the re-establishment of the Orthodox Church. Mironov, a big man in the government, is introduced as addressing a meeting of high officials and party members inside the Kremlin.

> "Our new religious policy will be valuable in smashing the anti-Soviet propaganda of the Roman Catholic, Lutheran, and other religious groups. Therefore do not underestimate the wisdom of our Party's action. We must, in the next period, take a broad view of the problem. We have the chance to draw the Orthhodox Church in other countries closer to Russia and make Russia the Third Rome."
>
> "But Comrade Mironov," one of the men present spoke up, "isn't there a danger that the new generation, which will one day take our place, may be spoiled by religious superstition?"
>
> "Don't worry on that score," he replied, smiling. "There is neither soil nor sap on which religion can feed in the U.S.S.R. After all, the press, theater, radio, schools, literature, all the forces of the mind are in the Party's sole control. It's clear to everyone that a young man with religious inclinations cannot possibly make a career. If he is not on our side spiritually and politically, there is no place for him. This is our supreme advantage. (p. 425)

University of North Carolina
—Helmut Kuhn

CORRESPONDENCE

January 23, 1947

The Editor:

Christian Frontiers.

Dear Editor:

Reading the *Christian Frontiers* during the past year has been keenly interesting to me. Some articles have been very fine and instructive, and some have been inaccurate and prejudiced. At least, so I see it. Your editorial on "C. F. and the Liberal Spirit" stirs me to make a few feeble comments. I intend them as kindly although they are frankly critical.

Your first three paragraphs I commend with hearty "amen." I disagree heartily with the fourth. I think there is more general indifference to doctrinal tenets among Baptists now than there has been in a generation or more.

But you have accused Baptists generally of idolatry. Every statement of Baptist position issued by any representative Baptist group (at least every one I have seen) places as a basic truth the teaching that the Scriptures are our only final authority in matters of religious faith. You say this is worshipping a book and is idolatry. That

is a serious and far-reaching charge. It labels *sin,* the fearful sin of idolatry, that fundamental principle on which every distinctive Baptist doctrine must rest for its ultimate support. I think this charge is neither "liberal," fair, true, nor reasonable.

I think you are most inconsistent in listing as one source of authority "the accumulated wisdom of the church" and in the same editorial denouncing the use of creeds as "a denial of the soul's liberty." How else has the church stated her "accumulated wisdom" more clearly and intelligently than in creeds?

What single item concerning the knowledge of God has come to us through the "accumulated wisdom of the church" or through "individualized Christian experience" which was not first revealed in the sacred Scriptures? I shall appreciate an answer to this question.

The Christ I know is the One I find revealed in the Scriptures. If the things concerning Him recorded in the Scriptures are not reliable, then I have no knowledge of Him except that of my own experience. But if one should interpret his religious experience in terms that do not agree with the Christ presented in the Book, he would not be justified in ascribing his experience to the Christ of the Book. He should not call it "Christ" or "Christian."

The Christ revealed in the New Testament accepted and repeatedly emphasized the final authority of the Scriptures. "Thy word is truth," "The scripture cannot be broken," "one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law until all be fulfilled," "the scriptures must be fulfilled in me" (Lk. 22: 37) "O foolish men, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have written." In many other such words Jesus emphasized his own reverence for the Scriptures. Jesus did not accept as authoritative any "accumulated wisdom" but particularly rebuked those who accepted the authority of tradition instead of the command of Scripture. (Mk. 7: 6-8) Let us hear this word, "In vain do they worship me, teaching as doctrines the precepts of men."

I insist that inasmuch as any one rejects the authority of the Scriptures as his guide, in that much he rejects the example and the teaching of Jesus Christ.

Your suggestion that believing the Scriptures as final authority is "denying God His rightful authority," it seems to me, has it just backward. If it were God, instead of the Editor, who had said that God chose to speak in the "accumulated wisdom of the church and the individualized Christian experience," then it would be idolatry to deny it. But since Jesus said about the opposite, surely if there is idolatry it must be in another quarter.

Yours for more liberal and unprejudiced Christian thinking.

Fraternally,

Truett Cox

NEWS

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA INAUGURATES RELIGION COURSES

Athens, Ga. (RNS) — For the first time in the history of the University of Georgia here courses in religion are being offered under a newly-established department of religion of the college of arts and sciences.

Dr. B. Davie Napier, former chaplain at Alfred University, New York, is head of the department and also university chaplain.

DAWSON SEES NEED FOR SPIRITUAL RELIGION

Washington, D. C. (RNS)—A new birth of spiritual religion, coupled with a revived leadership in the ministry, will be needed to cope with the problems arising from "the one world now forming," Dr. J. M. Dawson, executive secretary of the Baptist Joint Conference Committee on Public Relations, declared here in a sermon on "How Christianity Fared in 1946."

Reviewing church activities during the year, Dr. Dawson said the overall picture was one of "mingled darkness and light."

He said the churches had failed to solve such questions as the rising divorce rate, juvenile delinquency and crime, venereal disease, and alcoholism.

Moreover, he stated, there were deeply disturbing theological tensions in a number of major denominations, notably the Baptist, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, and Disciples.

Dr. Dawson also deplored the divided strategy of Protestants and Roman Catholics toward Russia which, he said, intensified the clamor for war in an hour when patience as well as firmness was needed to stabilize the United Nations for enduring peace.

N. C. NEGRO CLERGYMEN MEDIATE LAUNDRY STRIKE

Winston-Salem, N. C. (RNS)—Negro clergymen have stepped into the picture in connection with a laundry strike involving five plants here and are attempting to get the strikers and laundry owners together in a conference designed to end the stalemate.

Pastors of local Negro churches announced that "we consider the strikers' grievances are just and that their strike concerns all citizens of Winston-Salem, particularly the Negro and organized labor." The clergymen said "the refusal of the laundry owners to meet with the strikers makes it imperative that steps be taken to effect a meeting of the strikers and laundry owners, with a view to settling the strike."

LOUISVILLE BAPTISTS TO OPERATE BOY'S TOWN

Louisville, Ky. (RNS) — The one-man Boy's Town run in his own home on his own salary by the Rev. Edward J. Lee, Jr., Baptist minister, is growing up into a full-fledged institution patterned after Father Flanagan's famed community in Nebraska.

The new project will be a $70,000 institution on 12 acres near St. Matthews, a suburb on the eastern outskirts of Louisville, to house dependent children in this area.

Known as Louisville Boys' Town, the home will be operated on a non-sectarian basis by the Long Run Association of Baptists, parent body of 73 Baptist congregations in the Louisville area. The property includes an 11-room house, two cottages, a barn, tennis and basketball courts, and a swimming pool. Mr. Lee will be superintendent.

GEORGIA BAPTIST YOUTH ADOPT 'BILL OF RIGHTS' FOR NEGROES

Atlanta, Ga. — Representatives of 600 Baptist youth organizations in Georgia have adopted a "minimum bill of rights" for Georgia's Negro citizens.

Introduced before a meeting of the Royal Ambassadors, who represent the youth groups, the measure calls for the right to vote, the right to equal education, the right to serve on juries when cases involve Negroes, equal pay for equal work, and the right to work when qualified.

Adoption of the "bill of rights" at a time when the state general assembly was moving to enact "white supremacy" voting laws included in the late Gov.-Elect Eugene Talmadge's platform drew wide press comment.

The "bill of rights" has been recommended to the home chapters of the youth groups.

SECOND CO TEACHER FORCED TO RESIGN IN VIRGINIA

Staunton, Va. (RNS)—A second conscientious objector has resigned as a school teacher in Virginia under pressure from organized veterans' groups.

Wayne S. Guthrie, a conscientious objector in World War II and a teacher in New Hope High School in Augusta county, resigned after he and A. Crawford Gilkeson, division superintendent, had what Mr. Gilkeson described as a "frank discussion."

Mr. Gilkeson said that following action by the Staunton-Augusta Post 2216, Veterans of Foreign Wars, protesting the employment of conscientious objectors in public schools, he had "sounded out sentiment" in the county and had come to the conclusion he should discuss the matter with Mr. Guthrie.

Two weeks earlier, Evan Hollingsworth, conscientious objector and teacher at Marion (Va.) High School, resigned after the county American Legion post passed a resolution calling on the school board to request his resignation. Mayor B. L. Dickinson, of Marion, resigned as chairman of the school board in protest against the board's acceptance of Hollingsworth's resignation.

A REVAMPED THEOLOGICAL CURRICULUM

Louisville, Ky. — Baptist ministers must exert leadership in three vital problems which will face Southern states in the future, the Rev. Dr. William W. Barnes, research professor of Baptist history at Southwestern Baptist Seminary, Fort Worth, Tex., said here. He spoke at Founders' Day exercises of Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

The three problems he outlined were the Southern labor movement, race relations, and mental and nervous illnesses.

Suggesting a revamped theological curriculum "with new intellectual emphasis," Dr. Barnes said:

"As the intellectual level of Southern Baptist constituents has risen, training of ministers has received new impetus. Our seminary curriculum does not necessarily need new courses of study. It needs new interpretation on the courses we now teach."

He suggested that theological curriculum revision be made to "emphasize religion as distinguished from the forms of religion."

S. C. EPISCOPAL DIOCESE BREAKS PRECEDENT, SEATS NEGROES

Columbia, S. C.—Precedent was created here when the Protestant Episcopal diocese of Upper South Carolina voted at its 25th annual convention to seat eleven Negroes, representing eight local congregations. It was the first time that any Protestant denomination in South Carolina has conceded Negroes voting membership in its ruling body.

The two-day convention adopted a resolution calling on the National Council of the Church to inaugurate "a more vigorous" program of evangelism.

METHODIST COMMITTEE WILL COOPERATE WITH LABOR IN SOUTH

New York (RNS)—An advisory committee for cooperation with organized labor in the South has been set up by the Methodist Federation for Social Service, it was announced here.

Committee members include lay and clergy representatives from Alabama, Texas, Mississippi, Tennessee, Georgia, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and North Carolina.

FIRST WOMAN DELEGATE SEATED AT UNITED LUTHERAN CONVENTION

Cleveland (RNS)—History was made at the 15th biennial meeting of the United Lutheran Church here when Mrs. Howard S. Bechtolt was seated as the first woman delegate.

Mrs. Bechtolt, youthful looking grandmother from Chicago, said she did not want to precipitate "a battle of the sexes" at the convention, but felt it was time for "women to take a more active part in church affairs."

Her main interest, she added, is in the Church's missionary program because "mission fields are what women are naturally interested in."

CHRISTIAN FRONTIERS

A Journal of Baptist Life and Thought

VOL. II APRIL, 1947 No. 4

EDITORIAL BOARD

DAS KELLEY BARNETT, *Editor-in-Chief*

WILLIAM W. FINLATOR, *Associate Editor*
ALMONTE C. HOWELL, *Advisory Editor*
J. O. BAILEY, *Managing Editor*
WILLIAM M. POTEAT, *Book Editor*
MARJORIE E. MOORE, *Advisory Editor*
SARA LOWREY, *Poetry Editor*

SOUTHWIDE ADVISORY COUNCIL

W. O. CARVER, Louisville, Ky.

H. B. CROSS, Nashville, Tenn.
GEORGE B. CUTTEN, Chapel Hill, N. C.
J. M. DAWSON, Washington, D. C.
CLYDE V. HICKERSON, Richmond, Va.
EDWARD H. PRUDEN, Washington, D. C.
J. C. WILKINSON, Athens, Georgia
SWAN HAYWORTH, Vicksburg, Miss.
WITHROW T. HOLLAND, Haynesville, La.
ADIEL J. MONCRIEF, St. Joseph, Mo.
BLAKE SMITH, Austin, Texas
HUBERT R. HOWARD, JR., Tulsa, Okla.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

LEE C. SHEPPARD, *Chairman*

FRED B. HELMS
CARL LEE OUSLEY
R. K. REDWINE
JOHN MCGINNIS
WARREN CARR
A. C. MCCALL
WILBUR W. HUTCHINS

CONTENTS

Editorials 107
Niemoeller's Parish Once and Now ..... Helmut Kuhn 110
The Spiritual and Economic Basis for Democracy in the South ..... William Holmes Borders 114
Can You Imagine? ..... Mrs. L. E. M. Freeman 121
The Problems of Youth ..... Robert Ayers 123
The Christ of Many Forms ..... Henry Alford Porter 129
Books 134
News 136

Christian Frontiers is published monthly (except July and August) by the Baptist Book Club, a non-profit fellowship of ministers and laymen. Address all correspondence to Box 508, Chapel Hill, North Carolina. *Copyright 1946 by the Baptist Book Club.* *Entered as second class matter February 6, 1947 at the post office at Chapel Hill, N. C. under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription price, two dollars a year; twenty-five cents a copy. Printed by The Graphic Press, Inc., Raleigh, N.C.*

Who's Who In This Issue

HELMUT KUHN is a Professor of Philosophy at the University of North Carolina. He is personally acquainted with Niemoeller. Subscribers desiring to send food, clothing or money to members of Niemoeller's parish may do so through *Christian Frontiers*.

WILLIAM HOLMES BORDERS is Pastor of the Wheat Street Baptist Church, Atlanta, Georgia, and has been most active in the field of Christian ethics.

MRS. L. E. M. FREEMAN lives in Raleigh, North Carolina. Her article, "Her Name Is Mary," appeared in the January issue of *Christian Frontiers*.

ROBERT AYERS is state B.S.U. Secretary for South Carolina and is intimately acquainted with the problems of youth.

HENRY ALFORD PORTER for many years was one of the leading ministers of the Southern Baptist Convention. Dr. Porter died last fall. This is one of the last articles from his pen.

EDITORIALS

The Supreme Court Must Reverse Itself

MOVIES subjected to Roman Catholic censorship, newspapers pliant to the pressure of Roman Catholic banning, a United States' ambassador to the Vatican without Senate confirmation, and now public moneys to provide bus service for Catholic parochial schools! Lord, how long? A sleeping public has at last been roused by a Supreme Court ruling which represents a breach in the wall of separation of church and state. By a 5 to 4 vote the highest tribunal has ruled that public funds may be used to provide transportation of children to parochial schools. Here is a trend, long under way and supported by subtle propaganda of radio, press, and movie (and hierarchy), to circumvent our cherished First Amendment. Any amateur psychiatrist who has read the majority opinion written by Justice Black can detect sophistry and rationalization. Again and again this distinguished jurist eloquently professes devotion to the amendment, but the principle of the amendment, he reasons, does not apply in the small matter of taxing the public to get children to the schools of a sect that denounces public schools as godless. The close margin in voting, however, is hopeful with Justice Rutledge, son of a Baptist minister, and Justice Jackson writing forceful dissenting opinions. We will hear more of this unwise ruling as other communities take their lead from the Ewing Township case. Meanwhile let us join lustily in the rising chorus of an outraged public against this blow to the greatest of our guaranteed liberties. The court has reversed itself on former occasions when its decisions have clearly misfired. It must do so again.

Pastors and Belles-Lettres

IN his eulogy of Dr. J. H. Rushbrooke, whose death Baptists everywhere lament, Dr. Louie D. Newton referred to "the rare scholarship and Christian culture in

the radiant personality" of this leader who "spoke several languages fluently. . . . His knowledge of history was amazing, and he held appreciation for 'the best that had been thought or said,' to employ Matthew Arnold's phrase, which marked him in any company as a man of extraordinary culture." Baptists are sometimes inclined to be apologetic, or what is worse, defensive when the matter of culture among their leaders past and present is brought up in spite of our Broadus', our Rauschenbusches, our Mullins' and our Poteats. It is possible that because traditionally we have been a people's denomination we have not kept cultural pace with more fashionable denominations. The number is growing, however, of those who see in personalities enriched by the beauty, harmony, and nobility of art and literature tremendous advantages in interpreting the Bible, proclaiming the judgments of God to men, and understanding the deep recesses of motive and passion in the heart of man.

In a lecture entitled "The Preacher and Culture," Professor H. H. Farmer said: "One of the supreme marks of the great Christian soul—and how can one hope to grow in stature as a preacher, if one is not growing all the time as a Christian?—is that he can face quite frankly and realistically all the muck and misery, the tragedy and heartbreak, the agony and frustration of human life and yet find his sensitivity to high and holy things, his faith in their final victory—God's final victory—not only not impaired, but also growing stronger. A mature and strong Christian soul is at once ruthlessly frank and sincere in facing evil and corruption, and yet at the same time most sensitively responsive to what is good. . . . [Great literature] is one way in which we may cultivate what Whitehead has called 'the habitual vision of greatness,' without, however, any loss of real contact with life. For it is surely one of the distinguishing marks of great literature that it keeps you in touch with the realities of human existence and yet at the same time renews and nourishes and develops whatever sensitivity he may have to the great and mysterious possibilities and actualities of truth and beauty and goodness which somehow overshadow and interpenetrate it all."

Imperium In Imperio

BAPTISTS from all over the world will meet in Copenhagen this summer. Representatives of some 12 to 15 million devotees to liberty, the Bible, and the faith delivered unto the saints will gather to re-affirm the ancient and time-tested tenets of this faith and to draw strength from "alliance." They will come from lands where a state church is officially supported and dissenting sects are only tolerated, if not persecuted; from lands where freedom for all sects is guaranteed by law and no sect is favored; from lands where all institutional religion is held in scorn; from lands yet bleeding, and lands spared the horrors of war.

Never has the world needed more to hear the "distinctives" to which this alliance will give pronouncement. Absolute freedom of conscience in worship, absolute respect for the right of others to believe differently, absolute separation of church and state, the competence of each individual soul for God, non-sacramentalism, non-clericalism — these and other principles of the faith have been and still are under attack and must be forever defended and proclaimed.

Nevertheless the convocation at this time of such a group of like faith and order raises a qualm in the mind. It is a time when a world-organization of nations with vastly different political and economic creeds is struggling desperately to live. It is a time when most of the historic branches of Protestantism are moving toward a deeper fellowship, and the World Council of Churches, which will include the ancient Greek Orthodox Church, is striving to be a dynamic reality. Everywhere the old order is changing, and men are thinking politically, economically, socially, and (except Roman Catholics) ecclesiastically of "one world." If Baptists who gather in Copenhagen assert a sectarian spirit, if their pronouncements decry the ecumenical or church federation movements, if in an isolationist spirit the tremendous effort of Christendom to realize the "one Lord, one faith, one baptism" inherent in our gospel is simply ignored, then here is an empire within an empire. To put it in language we can all understand, it will be like a Norris-inspired convention meeting in the same city with a Southern Baptist Convention.

Niemoeller's Parish Once And Now

HELMUT KUHN

I

THE PARISH of Dahlem has two churches. In one of them the parishioners take pride, and they are fond of the other one. The Jesus Christ Church, the first of the two, is a trim modern brick building, set in the middle of a little park. Its older sister, the Chapel of St. Ann, boasts no such proud setting. It almost disappears behind a gray stone wall and the mounds and memorial tablets of the graves which huddle around it. But with the ivy that now screens its sides, the affection of the church people has grown upon the humble structure.

If Pastor Martin Niemoeller, once rector of Dahlem, could now return to his old parish, he would find his two churches standing, though marked by the war. Christ Church has been badly hit and is out of use. St. Ann, the beloved village church, has lost the top of its steeple, the picture of the Virgin Mary has disappeared from its choir, but the church still serves. The scars of war are even more conspicuous in the village itself, which is actually a suburb of Berlin. But more fortunate than other districts of Berlin, it has escaped the utter destruction which has been visited upon the vast majority of German cities.

The devastation of war, though less visible in Dahlem than elsewhere in Berlin, is nonetheless as terrifying here as it is all through Germany. The real devastation is in the minds of men. They have gone through the protracted horror of war and the inferno of air-raids. Their sons have been killed in action or are still languishing in French and Russian prison camps. They have suffered the brief but acute horror of Russian occupation, which meant pillage and rapine, and they are now prevented from enjoying the safety granted them under American occupation by the bleak hopelessness of their situation. With the exception of the communists among them the people of Berlin have a feeling as though they were stationed on the bridgehead which a retreating army has left in its rear. And they are cold, and most of the

time hungry. Half of the children can not go to school because they have no shoes, and the other half shiver in cold and overcrowded school rooms.

This pitiful story, however, does not tell the whole truth about Dahlem. In the minds of its citizens a hope and a faith have been kindled which the war and its aftermath were unable to extinguish. Dahlem, we remember, has been the battlefield on which Hitler suffered his first defeat. Since National Socialism was a philosophy even before it became a military power, this first defeat may still prove the final one.

II

In the fall of the year 1933 the people of Dahlem had a surprise. In the past they had just been able to fill the seats in St. Ann for Sunday morning service, but the larger Christ Church used to be half empty. Now they had to get up in time to find a place. People from all over Berlin, and soon from all over the country, crowded the aisle and beleaguered the doors. Extra buses and subway trains were needed to bring worshippers to Dahlem. One might well wonder what all the hubbub was about.

The simple fact was that in the churches of Dahlem Pastor Niemoeller and his associates preached the gospel. They did what every minister of the Word is expected to do, neither more nor less. But to do this simple thing at this moment meant to challenge the awful might of Hitler's Third Reich.

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." Preaching the first and greatest commandment was a challenge to Hitler who called himself Fuehrer and demanded fanatical adherence.

"Love thy neighbor as thyself." Preaching brotherly love was a provocation to the Nazi system, which included persecution and torture as an essential part of both its doctrine and its practice.

"Thou shalt not lie." Preaching truthfulness was a direct attack on the system of expedient deceptions which Nazi propaganda had built up. So we might go through a long list of Christian affirmations, and we would find that every one of them is a thrust at Nazi philosophy. There can be no peace between the believers in Christ who suffered death on the

Cross to save sinners, and the believers in Hitler, the self-proclaimed lord of the nordic super-race.

Even where peace is impossible, appeasers will abound. This was true also of the church under Hitler. The appeasers discovered a safe way in which the Christian message might be preached and yet give no offense to the Gestapo. Their method consisted in preaching God without submission to God's will, love without passionate self-surrender, and truthfulness with a lying mouth. The Christian doctrine, they found, can be almost completely expressed in comfortable generalities. The one little omission which they had to make was this: never a word was to be breathed about the Word of God applying to this actual world, to the real man, living now and here, child of God and subject of Hitler. The gospel had to be preached as though the soul of man had no dealings with his body, nor, in fact, with the larger portion of his mind.

Niemoeller, like many others, was not willing to make a harmless thing out of the Word of God. He did not forget that God who is love is also a consuming fire. He never preached political sermons, but he dared to preach Christian sermons. Therefore every word of his was a verdict upon the political world into which it was preached—a world of methodical violence and pregnant with war. This is why worshippers, believers, and also curious people, poured into Niemoeller's church. While the great lie of the Hitler myth closed down upon Germany, Niemoeller continued to speak the truth. This was the sensation of 1934.

Those who were with Niemoeller in the following three years of church struggle will never forget the man and his high courage. The members of the "Confessional Church" (this was the name of the association of those who repudiated appeasement) met every week in the parish house of Dahlem. Niemoeller spoke, interpreting the Bible and reporting on the progress of the struggle. There was no trace of defiance in his attitude, nothing of the heroic manner of Luther's, "Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise . . ." He rather spoke in the voice of one who, when roll is called, answers to his name. The hearers knew that at any moment officers of the Gestapo might burst into the room to arrest Niemoeller. The arrest

came in 1937. With it Niemoeller's martyrdom began—eight years of internment in various prisons and concentration camps, a considerable part of this time spent in solitary confinement.

III

Like the rest of Germany, Dahlem is now a place of misery. The hopes with which the Americans were hailed when they moved in to replace the Russians have died there as elsewhere under the crushing effects of the policy dictated by the Potsdam Agreement. But the misery is not total. The people of Dahlem, it seems, have not forgotten that they are Niemoeller's parish. They are not hopeless, not "without God in the world."

One of the oldest members of the Dahlem community wrote in a recent letter to a friend in America: "We who condemned Nazidom had to pass through great trials, and it was relief when at last the system of falsehood and fraud broke down. But the consequences are horribly cruel. There are things which grow under the pressure of suffering. So the congregation of Dahlem has incredibly increased in strength, and it is now a closely knit community. For once affliction has taught people to pray. The leading men are, of course, Professor Bartnong, the painter, and above all Pastor Dehnstaedt, a man of 35 years. He is endowed with a rare gift of preaching. Like Donatello's St. John the youthful figure stands in the pulpit, declaring the Word of God and preaching faith. For seven years a daily "'morning watch' has been held in the Chapel of St. Ann. If no minister is at hand, a lay member speaks . . . ."

If there should be a rebirth after the physical and moral devastation of war, the people of Dahlem may take pride in having saved and sheltered a seed of life. They have done, and are still doing, what the Apostle enjoins: "redeeming the time, because the days are evil." Wherever Christ's name is confessed, they deserve to be remembered among His witnessing communities.

The Spiritual and Economic Basis for Democracy in the South

William Holmes Borders

WE Southerners are not always willing to admit the truth about our section. Moreover, some attempt to ease our evils by pointing to similar defects elsewhere. With reference to the first, truth is never conditioned by willingness whether for or against. In the second case, to point out a weakness in another in an effort to hide one's own, cures neither.

The South has three major problems: poverty, ignorance, and disease. The national salary income in 1939 averaged $885.00. Not a single Southern state was up to the national average. South Carolina had an average of $481; Georgia, $461, and Mississippi, $389.[1] The richest state in the South ranks lower in per capita income than the poorest state outside the region.[2]

Eighty-five per cent of the wealth of the nation is owned by fifteen per cent of the people. The Northeast, one-fifth of the territory, owns four-fifths of the wealth. This means that the major portion of our wealth is concentrated in a relatively few hands in a relatively small area, and no Southern state is in this area.

The average Southern farmer grossed $186 a year as compared to $528 a year for farmers elsewhere. Share croppers received as low as 10¢ a day up to 30¢.[3] Industrially, common labor earned approximately 16¢ an hour less. The average industrial wage in the South was $865; in other states, $1219.[4] These are 1937 figures. Changes have occurred but more than likely proportionately. The South is relatively poor.

It is also relatively ignorant. In 1942, the national average spent per child in elementary and secondary schools was $98.31. Not a single Southern state met that standard. The South's average was $54.54. The annual salary of teachers in

1 *Statistical Abstract of the United States,* 1944-45, Department of Commerce, Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Commerce, p. 411.
2 *Report on Economic Conditions of the South,* p. 21, prepared for the President by the National Emergency Council.
3 *Ibid.,* pp. 26, 27.
4 *Ibid.,* p. 17.

Arkansas in 1933-34 was $465, compared to $2361 in New York State the same year. Overcrowding of schools and too many pupils per teacher are more prevalent in the South.

In higher education, there is also a lag. Two schools in the Northeast, Harvard and Yale, have larger endowments than all the institutions of higher learning in thirteen Southern states put together. More ignorance is to be expected in the South.

These facts do not deny that some of our best trained people were born and still live in the South. Neither does it deny that many people untrained systematically do solid and constructive thinking. Since schools are the main channels through which knowledge flows, and since Southern schools lag behind the national standard and illiteracy is higher in the South, we are driven to the conclusion that the South is relatively ignorant.

A third major defect of the South is disease. In the South people suffer more, receive less hospital care, and die faster. The South does not produce enough doctors for herself. With more ignorance and poverty, there is of necessity more disease. It is one thing to state a problem. It is more difficult to point out its solution. The first possible solution is political. If politicians were wide awake in the South, they could break the bonds of political slavery in twenty-five years. The South has voted in a block since the Civil War. No Democratic candidate for the presidency comes South to campaign, for he knows he has it "in the bag" the minute he runs behind a Democratic label. No Republican candidate ever comes either, because he knows that it had been decided before most Southerners were born that they would vote for a cat on a Democratic ticket. The result is that the South gets the leavings of both parties. The South would be helped by a two-party system.

Southern government could also do a great deal toward developing the many natural resources of the South. Having much more than its share of such resources, it could do its own processing, avoid an expensive freight rate, and allow the fat of the land to serve more richly the people who live upon it. In publicly supported schools, more should be taught the masses about economic geography, simple agriculture,

rotation of crops, forestry, soil salvation from erosion, decent civics, and investments, according to Southern needs. These are some of the things which might be further done through politics to help our section.

Consider our behavior in the light of other historical events. Between 1200 and 1250, the Catholic Church was at the height of its political and temporal power. There were two main evils, the denial of the freedom of conscience, and corruption in the church. Effort was made to correct these. The cry of heretics was made against the correctors. The Inquisition, killing hundreds of choice people, became the tool of the church to protect the evils.

These persecutions offered short-range advantages to the church and state. They were used as a political front; property of the victims was confiscated; hate against heretics distracted attention from the real issues.

In the sixteenth century the Edict of Nantes guaranteed full civil rights to Protestants, just as the Constitution guarantees full rights to the Negro. But the Hugenots were persecuted. Four hundred thousand were slaughtered. For political purposes, Louis XIV of France carried on an extensive campaign against the Huguenots in the name of religion.

Shifting from religious history to present-day politics, Hitler cut goods, lowered wages, and lengthened hours. To get what he had done out of the limelight he claimed the Jews were the cause, stirred up hate against them, and had them chased and butchered by the hundreds of thousands. In these cases, the main issues were covered by some superficial external.

The same kind of thing is happening in the South. Most politicians in the South who use race do so distastefully. No man chooses his race. It is nothing to brag about nor apologize for. When the Negro is denied his rights by the Talmadge forces in Georgia, the politician gets the office, the rich get richer and pay less taxes, the ignorant whites get a sense of satisfaction, and Negroes get persecuted. The South lags in delinquency. The South will never be able to run with one side paralyzed.

Another course of help lies in organization of labor. For the most part, capitalists recognize very little in the world

apart from power. Most politicians, like young Talmadge, will cut across the rights of the people, and jump through a loophole to get power. Most financiers will have shrewd lawyers inject clauses into contracts which give them unfair financial advantages. Even world statesmen play a game of power politics. Power is the only language they understand. The power of capital will not listen to labor unless it has the power of organization.

The stronger labor gets the more capable it will be of defending its position. A boy in school did not hang his cap on the rack. He had it on his desk. The teacher said, "James, I have told you repeatedly to hang your cap on the rack in the hall. I am tired of reminding you. I am sending you to the principal to be reprimanded. Go to the office and see him." As the boy crept unwillingly, like a snail, out of the room, the teacher picked up her buzzer, called the principal's office, "I am sending a boy to the office for punishment. I have told him repeatedly about hanging his cap on the rack in the hall."

On the other end: "Oh, yes, yes." Soon the boy came in. The principal got out his strap, went over, looked at him, and asked, "Sonny, what am I going to whip you for?"

The boy looked up and answered, "'Cause you are bigger than me."

The principal replied, "Son, I am afraid you are right."

Why does capital whip labor? 'Cause capital has more power.

When will it stop? When labor becomes of age. About three years ago I was talking to Hank Smith. He weighs about three hundred pounds and rocks when he talks and more when he walks. "Reverend, you know folks don't raise children like they used to. I was born in the country. My papa used to whip me something awful."

"About what?"

"About anything he told me not to do. He whipped me until I was nearly grown. One day he caught my head in between his legs. I was big and strong, 'bout nineteen. I was grown and he didn't know it. I lifted him right up on my shoulders."

"What did he do?"

"He was just up there wiggling until I put him down. He never did whip me no more."

By strength of organization, labor must convince capital that it is full grown. I certainly do not intend to imply that labor is all right and capital is all wrong. There are imperfections and imperfect people on both sides. If labor becomes unscrupulous and selfish, it will be just as evil as capital, guilty of the same things. There is not as much danger at present of labor becoming poisoned with the same disease as capital, as there is danger of labor not growing sufficiently strong through organization to demand its rights.

At what points, apart from organization, may labor look for help? Religion, at its highest and best, is obligated in its nature to aid all people, especially those in need. The more urgent the need the more religion is obligated.

The two cardinals of the Christian religion which must come to the aid of labor are brotherhood and the supremacy of personality. Brotherhood is a scientific fact by test of skull, brain, body, blood, height, shape, bone. Brotherhood is a historical fact from records of culture and the crossroads of civilization. Brotherhood is a fact in terms of achievements. Areas of knowledge have corroborated the declaration of the Bible: "From one blood all the nations of the earth come."

Jesus taught and lived "Brother" within and across racial lines. Whoever was in need got Jesus' help. A beggar, a blind man, a leper, a mourner, a diseased outcast, or a wayward traveler. On the Jericho road the man who fell among thieves was not the magistrate of the city, an aristocrat, a capitalist, but a certain man. The man who helped him was not a Pharisee, Sadducee, Zealot, or a Herodian. He was a Samaritan.

Jesus taught by example as well. When He sat on Jacob's well and the Samaritan woman came, it would have been good to have remained silent. Difference of race said, "Keep silent." Difference of background said, "Attend to your business." Five hundred years of history said, "Don't part your lips." The woman's attitude said, "Don't even say 'Good morning'." Meanness said, "Shut up; she'll claim you are picking a fuss with her."

Jesus did not heed the voices of racial difference, five hundred years of animosity, and meanness. Neither did He

allow the negative attitude of the woman to dampen. He took higher ground. To Jesus she was not a thing of contempt, but a precious soul loved and honored by God. My Bible asks the all-important and eternal question, "How can a man love God whom he has never seen and hate his brother whom he sees daily?" With a finger of love Jesus touched her heart. "You came for water but you really need the fire of religion to purge your heart of prejudice against Jews, and Jews need the torch of religion to burn hate from their souls. Because Jacob, your grandfather, dug the well, you have no monopoly on the water. Water is for all who thirst. More important than a well digger is God. Further, God's good earth, air, space, water and fruits of the earth are put here for all of God's children. This is the first word in creation and the last word from eternity."

Any violation of the tenet so strongly taught and lived by Jesus must be condemned by religion. If war, politics or capital in the hands of some butcher others, religion must not only stand guard but enter actively in the fight against it. If capital proposes to glut up the world like a hog while labor suffers, while the children of labor go undernourished, naked, barefooted, and ignorant, religion is obligated in its nature to rise with power and authority to defend the poor and exploited.

The second principle, the Supremacy of personality, also comes to the aid of organized labor. For Jesus, people were more important than all else. Once when going through the cornfield on the Sabbath, the disciples were hungry. Jesus plucked and gave the disciples to eat. He was severely criticized. His reply was the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath. Again, Jesus healed on the Sabbath, claiming it is right to do good on any day.

Some white people will buy a car a block long, pay five hundred dollars for a dog to sit in the back; run over a Negro carrying a load on his back; stop long enough to get out and curse him for not getting out of the way and for knocking the paint off the fender; and get back into the car and leave him to pull himself together.

Some Negroes must eat with white folks or die. I am not as much concerned about eating with white folks as I am

about having something for all of us to eat. I want to eat at the welcome table. I also want the welcome table to have something on it to eat.

Some capitalists, with millions stacked away, will grind the faces of thousands, cause babies to tug at empty breasts, cut school terms short, deny women rest periods, cut vacations, steal pensions, poison the public mind by disseminating propaganda, and bribe politicians that they might make more money, while human life about them shrivels and dies.

What is it worth to have a dozen billion-dollar corporations or a hundred thousand millionaires with millions of our people starving, destitute, penniless, hopeless and helpless? What does it matter with God if the stocks and bonds are high and share croppers make ten cents a day?

Finally, the prophetic in religion must wake up and live. Any person who thinks he can preach and can't inspire is done before he starts. Religion without intelligence will roam in the dark. Religion without fire will freeze in coldness. We need both. Some are short on facts and long on fire. Some are long on fire and short on facts. Some are short on both. The kind of prophetic I have in mind is not blind enthusiasm but an intelligent, courageous, righteous, powerful position which compels men. Several years ago I went to a convention and met many men. Standing upon a red clay embankment I saw a preacher whom I had met. I climbed up. "Hey, preacher."

"Hello, Doc."

"Do you live in Hawkinsville?"

"Yes, I live right here."

"Where is your church?"

"I got six churches."

"Six churches?"

"Yeah, man."

"How do you manage that? There are just four Sundays."

"Well, I tell you, I carries the spirit wit' me when I goes and they just waits 'til I come."

This man knew nothing about "higher criticism." Perhaps he would be better off if he did. It is perhaps equally true that some higher critics would be better off if they had his fire.

Can You Imagine?

Mrs. L. E. M. Freeman

SITTING there in your easy chair will you lose yourself in your imagination for just four minutes? Shut your eyes, and shut out the world.

Use one minute to think about your home, your family, your work. Your home is comfortable, pretty, adequate for the needs of your family and friends. Your yard is pretty and large enough for the children to play safely. You are in a nice neighborhood. You don't mean to boast, but distinguished visitors go down your street when they are given the keys to the city. Your family?—It is all you could hope for. You are secure in your love for each other. The future beckons with hope and gladness. You have had adequate training for your life's work, and you feel that you have a contribution to make to society. "The lines have fallen unto you in pleasant places," and you are grateful. Some of that good fortune is the result of your own efforts. Some is—shall we say, chance?

Let's suppose: The color of your skin has changed. You are no longer a white person, but a Negro. Why, your home has changed! A railroad is nearby, soot makes your house a dirty gray, and some of it has seeped through the windows and smudged the curtains. The yard is small and covered with ashes. Nothing can grow there. Your street has suddenly become narrow and muddy; the sidewalk is broken and uneven. No distinguished visitor would even be shown this street! You realize that this section of town is notorious for the things it does not have, street lights, police protection, clean streets, plumbing, a minimum of nuisances, and a maximum of comfort.

But surely with your education and recognized integrity nothing can hurt your inner self. Your brother is coming home from the army at long last. Your wife, being first of all a woman, wants everything in top-notch condition for his homecoming. After these years of making old things do, she must have some new things for the house and some new clothes for all. Being accustomed to going to good shops,

naturally she goes to them now. I saw her in the shoe department of a store early that morning as she started on her shopping spree. She was there before I was. The seats faced so that I did not see her after I sat down. After a long time I was waited on, and as I stood up to pay for my purchase, I saw her still sitting there. I said to the clerk, "The woman over in the corner should have been served before I was because she was here when I came in."

He glanced in her direction. "Oh, we won't wait on her. She can *buy* shoes here, but she can't try them on or bring them back."

I said, "If it is a matter of cleanliness—"

"It is the policy of the store." And there your wife sat and sat, waiting for service that would not be given, or even for an explanation. Who could bring himself to tell her she couldn't be waited on?

Your children are in school, and plan to go to college, of course. After college, what? The demand for Negro teachers is about met. Your college-graduate daughter may run an elevator, and your college trained son may be a janitor. One wants to be a doctor. Where can he go for training? The children are still little: they feel loved, wanted, and secure. Tell me, how and when are you going to teach them that society doesn't want them, that they are inferior, and must always give the impression of being "humble"? Suppose, when they grow up they have to fight for democracy. How will you teach them that it is right for them to fight that others may be free, but not expect it for themselves? Can you at the same time teach them not to be bitter?

With your mind and heart confused, you turn to the house of God. You always find peace there. Forgetting your color you go to your seat. When you sit down you are conscious of stares, of skirts being tucked a little closer, of the movement of people who suddenly find it desirable to move a little nearer the other end of the pew; and somehow you are conscious of a thought hanging in the air: "Doesn't he know his place is in the balcony?" Not even in the house of God are you received as a human being, and a brother.

Your four minutes are gone. Wake up!

Two thousand years are gone. Wake up!

The Problems of Youth

ROBERT AYERS

IN AN ARTICLE in the *Baptist Courier* entitled, "Don't Blame the Kids," Dr. W. C. Langston says, "Our children are but reflections of ourselves. If we do not like the looks of the image, we should examine the original and not blame the mirror." The miracle is that in spite of the problems and difficulties we make for them, so many of our youth actually become mature Christian men and women. Let us look at some of these difficulties under which youth must struggle.

First, let us look at our culture and attempt to analyze some that it places in the way of youth. Then we shall look at some specific institutions to determine whether or not they are meeting the needs of youth.

I. Anyone who takes a realistic view of our culture can hardly say that it is conducive to the best development. Youth faces a delinquent society and a delinquent culture. Our society is based on the principle of self-interest, and our culture is a product of our egocentric society.

There are in our culture certain patterns of thought which, once a youth is under their control, destroy his soul.[1] These patterns of thought may be outlined as follows:

One is a tendency to live in the immediate. In many of the movies, novels, and plays of today the basic assumption is that present satisfactions are all-important. Few people seek any other point of reference by which to make judgments. They simply do what promises best results at the moment. They make no attempt to determine how this act will contribute to any ultimate purpose, for they have no ultimate purpose. There is little vision past the present. But one cannot live adequately in time unless he has a grasp upon eternity.

Another pattern of thought is the philosophy that happiness is a total of pleasures. Our age is running itself to death in pursuit of pleasures. How wrong! Happiness is not a total of pleasures. A pleasure is the result of satisfying an appetite.

---

1 For some of these suggestions I am indebted to Dr. Roy Burkhart's *Understanding Youth.*

But an appetite can be so overindulged that it will enslave. Happiness rather is the harmony that comes from the integration of all the desires, dreams, and hopes of one's life.

A third pattern is the assumption that sex attraction is love and that romantic love will solve all problems. Popular movies and novels of today are based largely on this false assumption. No one will deny that romantic love is a great element in an enduring marriage. It is my conviction, however, that the alarming ratio of one out of every three marriages ending in the divorce courts is caused by the lack of practical knowledge, adjusted habit systems, and spiritual appreciation.

A fourth pattern is a too-optimistic view of the nature of man. Modern man is suffering from a complacent conscience. In spite of the fact that contemporary history is filled with manifestations of man's hysterias and furies, it does not seem to disturb his good opinion of himself. Reinhold Neibuhr in Vol. I of his *Nature and Destiny of Man* declares, "He [modern man] considers himself the victim of corrupting institutions which he is about to destroy or reconstruct, or of the confusions of ignorance which an adequate education is about to overcome. Yet he continues to regard himself as essentially harmless and virtuous." Modern man has ceased to consider himself a sinner dependent upon God's grace. One social scientist dismisses sin as a "psychopathic aspect of adolescent mentality." One school of thought naively assumes that the only trouble with man is that his reason hasn't completely subjugated his primitive nature; another that he has gotten too tangled up in his reason and ought to permit his primitive nature more expression; and still another that he just hasn't extended the scientific method far enough into all areas of life. The eyes of these scientists are not opened by the Christian revelation that the basic danger to man, as well as his loftiest possibilities, lies in his free will. They do not see that because man abuses his freedom, overestimates his power and significance, elevates himself to a position of equality with God while denying and disobeying God, he is a sinner.

The naiveté of modern thought about man is epitomized in the philosophy of Professor John Dewey of Columbia University. Perhaps more than any other single man, he has

influenced the thinking of America, especially in the field of education. His theory is that our problems would be solved by a freed intelligence that would work over despotic institutions which represent relationships fixed in a pre-scientific age. He has a touching faith in the ability of the scientific method alone to achieve in the field of social relationships.

What Professor Dewey and thousands of his followers fail to see is that neither science nor the scientific method can make one either good or bad. Margaret Slattery once told of a poor crippled boy who became the concern of several wealthy men. They paid thousands of dollars, and many operations were performed on the lad. Then came the day when the casts were removed and all of them were present to watch the lad take his first steps. Miss Slattery said she wished the story could end there, but it could not. Where is that boy today? He is in a state penitentiary. And Miss Slattery concluded, "Science can make a boy walk, but it can't teach him how or where to walk." Exactly so. There are many things that science and the scientific method can't do for us. No amount of scientific method can bring us goodness, or show us love, or reveal to us God.

No, the trouble with man lies not in his lack of the scientific method but in his lack of transformation; not in his lack of intelligence, but in his lack of goodness; not in his lack of plans, but in his lack of God. Man's basic trouble is his sin. Until modern man awakens from his slumber of contentment with himself, faces frankly the bitter fact that he is a sinner, and humbly depends upon God's grace mediated through Jesus Christ, there can be no progress toward the solution of the over-powering problems besetting us.

These false conceptions, then, are the patterns of thought working in our present world into which young people have come and within which they are in the process of becoming the persons they will be in their generation.

II. Not only is youth today facing a generally delinquent culture, but he is also limited by institutions delinquent in meeting his needs.

One of the foremost of his difficulties is a delinquent system of education. Its policies are completely in the hands of adults who, by and large, attempt to mold him into the

patterns of their own generation. Our educational methods are still primarily pigeon-feeding. "Many teachers hand over ready-made ideas. They are merchants of facts." The student is expected to hand them back as the teacher gives them out. Not only is he rewarded not to think, but he is often penalized if he does.

What is the result of this pigeon-feeding type of education? Simply this—that when a student finishes high school and college, he comes out with fragments of facts and segments of knowledge, but with no central philosophy or purpose in life. These differing facts have not been gathered around a central purpose so that life has continuous meaning. Frankly, I am not so greatly concerned about how many facts my child knows when she finishes school, as I am about what she loves, what she purposes, what she is. The almost completely secularized education of our day will give her little to love, no worthy goal to strive for, and few aids to her character development.

One of the greatest evils of our day is a system of education in this professedly Christian country that allows citizens of the future to have a heathen upbringing. The fact is that if you sent your child to a mission school in the heart of India, or the forest of Africa, he would have a much better chance of understanding Christianity, or really accepting Christ and being instilled with the Christian spirit, than if you sent him to a school in the next street. Unless something is done and done immediately to counteract the secularism and often outright antagonism of education to religion, there is the grave possibility that our country wil become in another three or four generations almost completely pagan.

Another delinquent institution which burdens youth with problems is the home. The home as a modern institution is pathetic. Here can be seen the great blight of that pattern of thought operative in our society that romantic love solves all problems. There is no real preparation for home life. Soon there are children, born to parents not prepared to bring them up. Why is it that most people seem to assume that they will automatically be the right kind of parents? The terrible truth is rather that many parents are "blighted trees." They know little about the laws that underlie personality growth or emo-

tional maturing. They are either caught in the meshes of a shallow social life which leaves them little time for their children, or they are the bewildered victims of a social order so barbarous that both parents must work to provide the bare necessities of life. In either case, the children are left to shift for themselves and are denied that love and gentle guidance that each growing child desperately needs.

Is it any wonder then that in an intensive study that Dr. Burkhart made of 153 high school students, he found that only 27 were happy in their relationship with their parents? The significant thing about the 27 who were happy is that they shared in an average of at least seven types of activities together with their parents.

If each child is to be provided with the best possible conditions for development of character, there must be in the home a fellowship of mutual love, understanding, and equality of status. He should be brought as early as possible to feel the protection of this fellowship for him and his responsibility to the family group. But beyond that he must come to feel that this fellowship of the family is an integral part of that larger fellowship with God and the Christian body.

Another institution often delinquent in its relationship to youth is the church. At some point or other in our program we must be failing our youth, for it is common knowledge that after the junior age, attendance of youth at church begins to decline. Why is this true?

For one thing, our teaching has often failed to meet the needs and to attract the interest of youth. It has not been life-centered. We teach the Bible, we reply, and to be sure that's what we ought to teach. When we say that teaching ought to be life-centered, that is not to quarrel with teaching the Bible. It is an objection rather to our method of teaching. It is to say that the best method of Bible teaching comes not through beginning with a passage of Scripture, giving its exegesis, and then tagging on an application, but rather through using the same method Jesus used throughout his lifetime, starting with people where they are. Jesus always began with people. We will have the best results when we, too, begin with their problems, then show how God's eternal truths revealed in His Holy Book apply to these problems.

Not only must our teaching be more life-centered, but also our preaching. Too often our preaching resembles the flight of the humming bird: it never lights anywhere. Many of our sermons fail to reveal any awareness of the conditions of the world in which we live or of the needs of individuals or of any practical solution to their problems.

Again, how many ministers give as much time to visitation and counseling with young people as they do with adults? How many take time and put forth the effort really to know the youth of their church? Are there many ministers who keep a separate file of their young people with separate folders? I know of only one minister who does so.

Here is a boy suffering the humiliating problem of personal abuse. Will he go to the minister? Likely not. He will consider that more than likely his minister will draw his coattails around him in holy horror and prattle off some moralistic advice, that he will be more humiliated than ever.

It is my conviction that the church has the greatest opportunity of any institution in society of developing youth into the builders of a new world. It is the one institution that can combat the false patterns of thought operative in our society. Through its preaching, teaching, and training ,it can provide the principles of Jesus as man's source of values. It can show man the true happiness of a well-balanced life, the real meaning of love, human and divine, and the urgent need of God in individual life and society. It is the one institution that can transform education into an agency of God through demanding that Christian teachers be given the freedom to express those Christian convictions that are common to all. It is the one institution that can save the home by bringing its teachings to bear directly on the appalling problems besetting modern family life. It can, if we will awaken to our weaknesses and be responsive to the vast opportunities that lie before us.

Youth is the only group that can save this world of ours. Grownups are too old, too blind, and too steeped in custom and tradition to do it. Only youth has the qualifications. Only youth has life and daring enough to do it. But these are nothing without Christ. We dare not fail to give them Christ. We must not fail.

The Christ of Many Forms

Henry Alford Porter

THE RESURRECTION stories are very beautiful and very wonderful. But the most exquisite of them all is the story of Christ's appearance on the first Easter evening to two unknown disciples as they walked from Jerusalem to Emmaus. These men were dragging themselves over the seven miles from the capital to their village home, burdened with despair. And then He came. The risen Christ drew near and went with them.

They did not know him at first. True, as He walked and talked with them, their hearts burned within them, but something prevented recognition. Mark tells us what it was —"He appeared to them in another form."

That is symbolic of an eternal characteristic of Christ. That is what He has been doing from generation to generation—appearing in different forms. "One generation passeth away and another generation cometh," and how differently the succeeding generations see Him and think of Him and His truth.

I have in my library sermons by ministers of generations gone. They were able preachers, consecrated characters, devoted servants and sincere interpreters of Christ. And yet if you were to read one of their sermons, you would find their theology strange and their Christ different, a Christ unrelated to many human problems. We need the same Christ they knew and loved and worshiped and served, but in another form.

Different Periods of History

Anyone who knows anything of the history of Christianity knows how different Christ's appeal has been to different periods. Each has had, in a sense, a Christ of its own. That helps to account, as Frederick Spurr, a notable Baptist preacher of England, reminded us years ago, for the various denominations of Christendom. They arose, in large measure, from different interpretations of Christ and His message to mankind.

It is a sad and tragic story in some ways. One group would

insist that its view was the only true one, and that if Christ did not appear to others in the one particular form that He did to them He did not really appear to the others at all. And so we have that long record of strife and bitterness and slander and persecution among those who professed to be the disciples of the same Master.

We have reached a better understanding today and realize that the appearance of Christ in differing forms to these various groups was originally due, as a rule, to their emphasis on some truth or truths about Christ and His message that had been forgotten or neglected, and that nearly every form in which He appeared was particularly needed at the time.

I am a Baptist, and the longer I live the more of a Baptist I am. And yet I believe that no denomination has ever seen all there is of Christ and His many-sided truth. There is significance in the statement: "There is one Christ and we all need him; there are many Christs and we need them all."

Different Stages of Life

Christ appears in varying forms in each stage of life. The child sings of the gentle Jesus, meek and mild, who looks upon a little child. He knows something about the Saviour's birth and life and death, but little about His work and purpose in the world.

A man may say, "I have outgrown the faith of my childhood." So he should. He should see Christ then in another form—a larger Christ and a mightier, the incomparable Leader and Inspirer of men, whose "Follow Me" calls him to high endeavor.

When grown old, he may see Christ in yet another form, as the faithful Friend of the long day of life, coming then to lead him through the evening shadows to the unfading light of the everlasting home.

We are, as Peter tells us, to "grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ." We should not have the same view of Christ we had 10 or 15 years ago, or even a year ago. If we do, it is because we have not been growing in knowledge of Him.

Christ appears in varying forms to different persons. He did even in the New Testament. The writers had different

views of His many-sided work and personality. He appeared in one form in the synoptic gospels, another in the gospel of John, another in the writings of Paul, another in the letter to the Hebrews, another in the Epistle of James, and in yet another in the book of Revelation. All the way through He is the very same Jesus, but He is seen from different points of view.

Different People

He still appears in different ways to different people. There is an infinite variety in Him, and He manifests Himself in forms as manifold as the needs of human minds and hearts and the conditions of human life. He follows no regulation method. He draws near to men in diverse forms so that every man may have a Christ of his own.

This truth should be remembered forever by the preacher. He should seek to preach the whole of Christ so that each who hears should see with his own eyes a Christ adapted to his need.

This truth should be remembered forever also by our missionaries and mission boards and all who are seeking to win the races of mankind to Christ. A Negro church in the deep South has put in its stained glass window a Negro Christ. Why not? He belongs to one color as much as to another. He belongs to the East as much as to the West.

Kipling, after a long sojourn in India, wrote, "East is east, and west is west, and never the twain shall meet." But they meet in Christ. Different races see Christ differently, but the glory of the Christian religion is that it has a Saviour adapted to every race, and this multiform Christ can reveal Himself and manifest His redeeming grace and power to the black as to the white, to the east as to the west, to all the races of the world, and to each in its own way.

The Japanese need not become English Christians, nor the Chinese American Christians. They could not if they would. So let us not try to press them into our western mold. Let us, rather, entertain the hope that our Master whose life on earth was lived in the East may find discerning interpreters there who will make a unique contribution to the fuller understanding of our many-sided Christ, and thereby

to the enrichment of our faith.

Let us not be afraid to face the fact that Christ may appear in ever so many ways. Let us rejoice rather in His inexhaustible wonder and His everlasting freshness. The apostle John said that if all the things that Jesus said and did were written down, the world itself could not contain the record. That is an hyperbole, but the literal truth is that we never get to the end of Him.

The writer of the book of Hebrews exclaimed, "Jesus Christ, yesterday, today and forever the same." But he could have said just as truthfully, "Jesus Christ, yesterday, today and forever different." There has been a succession of "Lives of Christ" almost without number, and doubtless this will continue till the end of time, for every generation calls for a Christ of another form.

No Need To Be Fearful

Let us not be afraid if Christ makes His appearance in some form that is not familiar to us. An old woman, telling of her long-absent son's return from the war, said, "He stopped there on the sidewalk speaking to someone, and I gave a glance at him, and never thought who it was. All those long weeks and months I'd been waiting and watching and praying for him to come and then didn't know him at first. I even wondered to myself who was coming to interfere with my work."

So are we apt to be slow to recognize any unaccustomed form of Christ, and to be fearful of any unfamiliar phase of His truth. It was said that when the boys came home from overseas they would bring with them a new conception of the religion of Christ and a new view of His church, which is to say they would see Christ in another form.

I think numbers of our returned men have a new apprehension of Christian service. They have seen another, a larger Christ, binding up not only the wounds of the individual but also the wounds of society, a Christ bent on saving the world from its competitive strife, its incomplete democracy and its false nationalism.

It is said of the disciples that as Christ walked ahead of them, His face steadfastly set toward the Jerusalem of His

scourging and spitting and death, "As they followed they were afraid." They had caught at last a clearer view of His redeeming purpose and how it was to be attained, and they were fearful.

Why should we be afraid of larger meanings of His mission to mankind, even though they seem to be so different from those entertained before as almost to give us another Christ? We follow an ever-increasing and advancing Leader, a Leader equal to all the problems of a humanity constantly on the march.

What of the future? There may be dark and rough times ahead of us, but I believe the stage is being set for some cosmic happening. A new world is rising from the ashes of the old. A new day is coming up in thunder from the east. A new Christ is emerging from deeper insight into his life and words and purpose.

"For I doubt not through the ages
One increasing purpose runs,
And the thoughts of men are widened
With the process of the suns."

BOOKS

The Significance of Silence and Other Sermons.
By Leslie D. Weatherhead.
New York, Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1945. 238 pages.

Dr. Weatherhead would probably feel complimented to know that this reviewer heard the title sermon of this volume preached recently in a church which he chanced to attend—preached point for point, illustration for illustration, with hardly a variation. It is a good sermon, and I enjoyed it both times: when I read it, and when the preacher read it. The incident has helped answer for me the question, who reads books of sermons, anyway? Publishers must find them profitable ventures, for the market is flooded with them. Do I have the answer—preachers buy them to get ideas for sermons? At any rate I can recommend Dr. Weatherhead's book to other preachers.

In this book they will find twenty-two excellent sermons, including the title piece. They will also find a longish preface, to me more interesting than any sermon, which describes the work of the great City Temple in London, of which Dr. Weatherhead is pastor, and incidentally an insight into some of the pastoral methods which have made his church a model for metropolitan church work both here and abroad.

The student of sermon literature will find in this volume many excellent examples of the well-made sermon. Severely limited to the traditional twenty-minute length (after which no souls are saved), these sermons show the careful construction necessary for oral delivery before a popular audience. A typical sermon has three or four main points, each carefully noted, often by number, with a transitional sentence and rounded with a summary. There is an introduction and a conclusion. These carefully noted points and transitions make the sermons a delight to study, and excellent models of the preacher's art today.

If poetry should be simple, sensuous, and passionate, how much more should the oratory of the pulpit, which touches the hearts of believers who are already filled with the tender emotions of religion when the preacher begins his discourse? Such a description as Milton used well fits Dr. Weatherhead's style. It abounds in lovely poetic phrases, such as this, from his sermon "Thou shalt love thy neighbor," "Love . . . is the loveliest of all things that rise in the consciousness of man, the most perfect flower his personality produces." Familiar words, simple figures of speech, concrete images and language, these mark his style, which is naturally colored by his frequent references to the Bible, sometimes in whole galaxies at once, Biblical references, I hasten to add, are not used for proof-texts but to open the wealth of worship and wisdom, faith and

lovingkindness, which the Bible offers for its readers.

One more item deserves note: Dr. Weatherhead's illustrations. They are, of course, chosen from all the resources at his command, but principally from his own experience, or from those of his friends. Hardly a sermon in the book is without its personal anecdote, often based on what someone has told him, or some incident in his pastoral work. They light up his theology and ethic in the same way that the modern journalist's accounts of a great man's exploits are enlivened with biographical anecdote. But poetry, too, both modern and standard, both English and American, is a frequent source of illustration, or, shall I say reinforcement. Certainly his use of poetry is illuminating to his messages, and to me one of the finest things in the book. And finally, Dr. Weatherhead is not afraid to bring evidences of his study to his service — especially the results of his reading in books on religious themes. I note Pascal, Luther, Ghandi, Jeans, C. S. Lewis, Dr. Dodd, and many others among the authors to whom he referred or from whom he quoted.

Finally, a word about Dr. Weatherhead's themes will indicate what spiritual feasts, and yet how well-balanced a diet, the congregation of the City Temple had during the period when these sermons were delivered. My classification shows something like this division of topics: On God and His Character (5), On Christ and the Gospel (3), On the mystic appeal of Religion (3), Miscellaneous sermons of religion and personality (4), On the duties of the Christian (7), divided as follows: three on love, two companion sermons of church attendance, and a similar pair on Bible study.

Thus the modern catalogue of sermon topics is fairly covered. Naturally hell-fire and damnation, traditional dogmatic theology, and personal morality receive scant treatment. It is pretty late to scare men into heaven; the dogmas which delighted our fathers stir no modern audience; and Dr. Weatherhead wisely realizes that sermons on temperance, sabbath-breaking, card-playing, dancing, and all the traditional sins on which protestant preachers love to harp, would be small potatoes for audiences wracked by the terrific cataclysm of world war. His sermons may be described in a word as messages of comfort for suffering humanity.

Dr. Weatherhead's book is a permanent contribution to that type of religious literature, the book of sermons, without which Dr. Johnson said no library was complete, and takes its place in the great collection of English sermon-books which begins with Latimer and contains such great names as Donne, Taylor, Tillotson, Butler, Sterne, Newman, and Drummond.

A. C. Howell

The University of San Carlos de Guatemala

NEWS

LUCE CALLS FOR NEW REFORMATION IN PROTESTANTISM

Chicago — A new Reformation with a revitalized theology is a major need of contemporary Protestantism, Henry R. Luce, publisher of *Time, Life* and *Fortune* magazines, said here at the annual luncheon of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago.

Luce, son of a Presbyterian missionary, criticized "the non-creedal, non-theological, non-ecclesiastical, fashionable Protestantism of the last few decades" for uttering "an appalling amount of nonsense not only about religion but also about politics and economics, about war and about peace."

He said Protestantism in the twentieth century "has been blown about by every wind of secular doctrine."

Protestantism today requires a stronger and better theology and a clergy that will preach this theology, Luce contended, adding that laymen "have no greater responsibility than to see to it that we have a thoroughly trained, intellectually disciplined pastorate."

The publisher asserted that Sunday school curricula should be drastically altered to bring more teaching about God and the Bible into church schoolrooms.

"What about Christianity in the public school system, which over the past century Protestants were mainly responsible for having established?" he asked.

Although religion in the public schools is a "tough" question, he said, "it is certainly time that Protestants, if they don't do anything else, should unite on a program to bring the knowledge of God to our boys and girls at school."

SEES 'HOPEFUL SIGNS' FOR PROTESTANT CHURCHES IN RUSSIAN ZONE OF GERMANY

Geneva (RNS) — Lack of full freedom for Protestant churches in the Russian zone of Germany still causes anxiety, but there are certain hopeful signs, according to Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, general secretary of the World Council of Churches.

He said that there are encouraging reports of friendly understanding achieved in cases where church representatives "come into open contact with military authorities."

As an illustration, Dr. Visser 't Hooft cited one town where people were required to work on their farms on Sundays. The minister approached the local commandant and pointed out that the ten commandments require Christians to observe the Sabbath. The officer countered by asking what these commandments were and when recited to him, he replied: "This is indeed outstanding, and should be preached everywhere."

"From that day on, no more work was demanded on Sundays," Dr. Visser 't Hooft said.

CHRISTIAN FRONTIERS

A Journal of Baptist Life and Thought

VOL. II | MAY, 1947 | No. 5

EDITORIAL BOARD

DAS KELLEY BARNETT, *Editor-in-Chief*

WILLIAM W. FINLATOR, *Associate Editor*
ALMONTE C. HOWELL, *Advisory Editor*
J. O. BAILEY, *Managing Editor*
WILLIAM M. POTEAT, *Book Editor*
MARJORIE E. MOORE, *Advisory Editor*
SARA LOWREY, *Poetry Editor*

SOUTHWIDE ADVISORY COUNCIL

W. O. CARVER, Louisville, Ky.

H. B. CROSS, Nashville, Tenn.
GEORGE B. CUTTEN, Chapel Hill, N. C.
J. M. DAWSON, Washington, D. C.
CLYDE V. HICKERSON, Richmond, Va.
EDWARD H. PRUDEN, Washington, D. C.
J. C. WILKINSON, Athens, Georgia
SWAN HAYWORTH, Vicksburg, Miss.
WITHROW T. HOLLAND, Haynesville, La.
ADIEL J. MONCRIEF, St. Joseph, Mo.
BLAKE SMITH, Austin, Texas
HUBERT R. HOWARD, JR., Tulsa, Okla.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

LEE C. SHEPPARD, *Chairman*

FRED B. HELMS
CARL LEE OUSLEY
R. K. REDWINE
JOHN MCGINNIS
WARREN CARR
A. C. MCCALL
WILBUR W. HUTCHINS

CONTENTS

Editorials 139

The Minister—Key Man in Race Relations ..... Edward A. McDowell 143

A Study in Denominationalism ..... William W. Barnes 150

"Thy Kingdom Come" ..... C. S. Gardner 159

Books 165

News 167

Christian Frontiers is published monthly (except July and August) by the Baptist Book Club, a non-profit fellowship of ministers and laymen. Address all correspondence to Box 508, Chapel Hill, North Carolina. *Copyright 1946 by the Baptist Book Club.* *Entered as second class matter February 6, 1947 at the post office at Chapel Hill, N. C. under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription price, two dollars a year; twenty-five cents a copy. Printed by The Graphic Press, Inc., Raleigh, N.C.*

Who's Who In This Issue

EDWARD A. McDOWELL, a graduate of Furman University, is Professor of New Testament Interpretation at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary at Louisville, Kentucky. During the past year, Dr. McDowell, on Sabbatical leave from Furman, has been visiting lecturer on New Testament Greek at Union Theological Seminary in New York City.

C. S. GARDNER, now retired, was for many years Professor of Homiletics and taught the first courses in Christian Sociology at the Southern Baptist Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky. *Christian Frontiers* takes pride in printing a sermon Dr. Gardner preached to the Southern Baptist Convention in 1911. In our judgment, his approach to social problems is timeless.

WILLIAM W. BARNES is Professor of Church History at the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas. Dr. Barnes is an authority on Southern Baptist history.

OUR REVIEWERS for this month are W. W. Finlator, Associate Editor of *Christian Frontiers;* J. C. Herrin, Student Minister of the Baptist Church in Chapel Hill; and J. Winston Pearce, Pastor of the First Baptist Church, Durham.

EDITORIALS

Just What Are "Messengers"?

WHAT are "messengers" at our Baptist conventions? The answer seems to depend upon the particular matter before the convention. If, for example, a motion to join a state convocation of churches is being considered, then is raised the cry that the assembly is composed not of delegates but of "messengers" with no authority to commit the local churches to any such action. If, on the other hand, the convention is contemplating joining other denominational groups in something like an alliance for a return to Prohibition, and funds are needed for the endeavor, then the messengers commit their local congregations lock, stock and barrel! Messengers then are at one time mere good-will boys who cannot pass measures or adopt resolutions binding on the folks back home, and at another time true crusaders of the church, panoplied in authority. They can plead impotency when matters frowned upon by their leaders are considered; they can brandish concealed weapons of authority when more favored items are before them. Thus while the North Carolina Convention at Asheville would have rejected any motion to join the N. C. Council of Churches on the grounds that it lacked the authority, yet it rescinded its action on the resolution concerning race and class discrimination under a barrage of eloquent assurances that such action would compel the churches and denominational colleges to open their doors to "our Negro brethren"! The "messenger" system is a clever subterfuge, exploited to work both ways. It is time for our people to recognize it for what it is, reject it on the grounds that it comes close to hypocrisy, and send men and women to our conventions with delegated authority, "power to act."

Are We Afraid Of Our Laymen?

STANLEY HIGH'S article "Enlist the Laymen, Mr. Taft," appearing in the February 12 issue of *The Christian Century* makes wholesome but discomfiting reading

for every Southern Baptist proud of the non-clerical character of his denomination, whose "priests" are simply baptized believers. Expressing hearty approval that Mr. Charles P. Taft, recently elected president of the Federal Council of Churches, is not a clergyman, Mr. High names three evils in Protestantism, secularism, denominationalism, and clericalism, and he discusses the third, clericalism. The first most Southern Baptists will agree to be evil; to the second, they will be indifferent; at the third, they will be astonished. What, our Convention a clerical and non-laymen affair? Preposterous! Nevertheless the charges Mr. High levels against Protestantism in general are clearly true of our denomination. Laymen and laywomen, especially younger, aggressive ones, are not only absent from, but in the main indifferent to the assemblies and conventions of our churches. A hierarchy runs the show.

A hierarchy never trusts the ark and sacred vessels of the denomination to the people. A hierarchy is afraid of the people.

Says Mr. High: "The Protestant enterprise in the United States is preacher-ridden. When Protestantism speaks, the language, the voice and the meaning are clerical. What Protestantism does is planned by preachers. What Protestantism refuses to do is explained by preacher-reasons." In his efforts to advance the cause of Protestantism, "Mr. Taft will find himself . . . often afoul of the clergy—and particularly those of the clergy who have left the earth-seasoned realities of the parish ministry to become members of the hierarchy of denominational and conventional officials." When laymen do attend the church meetings they, "like freshmen congressmen, are seen and not heard. . . . In the actual business of determining where the church shall stand and what it shall do, the preachers—by virtue of their acquaintance with each other, their familiarity with the proceedings, their training in and their capacity to get excited about ecclesiastical and theological obfuscations, and their facility in public speech —are the works." Has Mr. High been listening in, Drew-Pearson fashion, at some denominational gatherings? "It is exceedingly difficult to persuade top laymen in any denomination, if they are still young enough to be in active business

or professional life, to serve at all or more than once. As a result, lay delegations are heavily weighted with laymen who have retired and with others for whom the trip and the occasion are a capital 'E' Event."

Of course there are many notable exceptions to this picture, and of course there are several justifications for a clergy-dominated conference. But the general indictment holds, and a chief cause (let us be frank) for this clericalism in a layman's denomination is the inherent fear of the undenominationalism and non-bureaucracy of the laymen. How would a lay-dominated Baptist convention feel about a state council of churches, the Federal Council, the World Council? What expressions would it make concerning some of the policies and practices of, say, our Sunday School Board? What opinions might be voiced in a discussion—and it might be brought up—of close communion? A prominent advocate of "the American way" was recently alarmed lest our nation's economy fall into the hands of the people. How many of our clergy would tremble at the possibility of lay-control of our layman's religion?

If we admit that the average layman does not know enough about our Baptist work to direct the affairs of the denomination, we confess not only to failure in indoctrination, but to fear of democracy among the most liberty-loving religious sect in the world. If we argue that the laymen would not stay in the Baptist groove, we infer that only the clergy are to be trusted as guardians of the faith. An attitude of Roman Catholic clericalism enters the ranks of freedom-loving Baptists! As Mr. High says: "The Catholic hierarchy can put the Roman Catholic Church on record, and is listened to accordingly. But both the general public and the churchgoing public are aware, I think, that no such authority is vested in the Protestant clergy. That fact has been part of the Protestant boast." Well, if it is our boast, let's make it our practice. To our distinguished president let us say, "Enlist the layman, Dr. Newton." And to our leaders throughout the state conventions, "More and more and yet more laymen, please!"

United Nations Snubbed

THE League of Nations was doomed to failure because of America's refusal to have any active part in it. If the United Nations fails it will be because America in a new interventionist role ignored and by-passed it. By the time this goes to press Congress will have given the Administration the green light to prop up and bulwark a decadent monarchy in Greece, a monarchy which has given ample proof of its fascist leanings, and to support a despotic government in Turkey. And all in the name of democracy and national defense! The Monroe Doctrine has been extended in concept, and soon will be extended in practice, from the Western Hemisphere to the Dardanelles. It has been recently given a trial in China, where it failed tragically. It will fail ultimately in Greece and Turkey. While it is true that no one wishes to remove all obstacles to Russian expansion, it is also true that most Americans show a shocking lack of imagination in appreciating Russia's legitimate interest in desiring friendly governments along her borders. Clearly here is a problem which should be dumped promptly into the lap of the United Nations. How would we feel if Russia sent food and arms and military personnel to Mexico to build up a wall against democracy? There is absolutely no hope for our planet without a super state to resolve such differences between its member states. This super state must be able to speak and act with ultimate authority. The present action of our government is a body blow to the United Nations. It is being killed while aborning. Wake up, America!

The Minister—Key Man In Race Relations

EDWARD A. MCDOWELL

1. Soul Sickness

THE minister of Jesus Christ is called to be a physician of souls. For this reason, if for no other, he can be the key man in race relations. Race prejudice is a sickness of the soul, as racial conflict is a sickness of society. The tragedy of our situation in the South is that for the most part our people do not realize that they are victims of spiritual sickness in accepting and perpetuating un-Christian racial patterns. They need physicians who can diagnose the illness and prescribe the cure. Who better than the Christian minister is equipped for this service?

People who are ill do not act like normal human beings, especially if the illness from which they suffer is of the mind and soul. Brutality is not normal in a civilized community. Especially is it not normal among the people of the South where courtesy, kindness, and religion are revered and democracy is praised. Southern people who give expression to racial hatred and intolerance are at war with themselves. This is why incidents of inhuman and often brutal treatment of Negroes are common in the South.

This sickness of the South damages the souls of white and black alike. Perhaps the prejudiced white Southerner is as unaware of the damage prejudice does to his own soul as he is ignorant of the damage it does to the soul of the Negro. Two incidents of the baneful workings of prejudice have come to the personal attention of the writer.

The first involves one of the most distinguished Negro leaders of America. This man would be honored in any white gathering in the world outside the South. He is a Ph.D. graduate of one of the great universities of the United States and is a wearer of the Phi Beta Kappa key. He is listed in *Who's Who in America* and is the president of one of the leading Negro educational institutions of the South. On one occasion he found it necessary to send a telegram from the railway station of the city in which he lives. Because there was no telegraph office in the Negro waiting room he went to the

telegraph office in the white waiting room to write his message. While he was standing at the desk writing his message, a white man came up and without warning struck his hat from his head, shouting at the same time: "Take your hat off, nigger; don't you know you have to take your hat off in the presence of a white lady?" Restraining himself, and without a word, but all the while fearful of physical violence at the hands of the white man, the college president picked up his hat, put it on, and resumed the writing of his message. This he did, he says, to maintain his self respect. He managed to escape the encounter unscathed in body, but not without being shaken in soul. The white man had given vent to the sickness in his soul and in so doing had hurt the soul of a great and good Christian Negro.

The second incident also involves a Negro educator, a teacher in one of our best Southern Negro colleges. During the war he decided to go into war work for the government. A physical examination was necessary, and he visited a doctor's office to secure it. He arrived early at the office but was forced to sit for several hours and wait while all of the white patients were served. Finally when all of the white patients had had their turn he was called. When his blood pressure was taken the doctor shook his head and said, "Your blood pressure is too high; I can't pass you." The teacher's reply was revealing. "Doctor," he said, "it's natural that my blood pressure should be high. I got to your office early, and yet I had to sit in your waiting room hour after hour and see all of the white people go in ahead of me. You know how that made me feel; all the time my blood pressure was going up." The teacher pressed his point with a significant question. "Don't you know," he asked the doctor, "that all of us colored people have higher blood pressure than the white people because of this sort of thing?" The doctor saw the point, accepted the explanation, and gave his client an acceptable blood pressure reading. But does not this incident poignantly illustrate the baneful effects of prejudice upon the bodies as well as the souls of Negro people?

2. Community Sickness

Wherever there is racial conflict in a community, North or South, that community is in an unhealthy condition spirit-

ually. Often the causes of tension are allowed to fester when they should be dealt with and eliminated. They are always dangerous. They can become the causes of violence and bloodshed. When present they hang like a pall over the homes and lives of people who are entitled to the freedom and happiness guaranteed under the Constitution. One of the tragic aspects of life in the South is that the "health" of the community is endangered by the suspicions, fears, and hatreds of one group in regard to the other. White prejudice against the Negro and Negro resentment against the white man are passed from generation to generation, and this in a land of beauty, love, song and laughter, a land of religion, designed by God for happiness. The imposition by the white group of certain customs designed to remind the Negro continually of his inferiority reacts in an unhealthy way upon the personalities of both Negroes and white people. Custom demands that the Negro think of himself as inferior, but in many cases the psychological reaction, particularly among Negro youth, is that the Negro wishes to demonstrate his superiority. This reaction may produce some good results, such as driving the Negro to secure the best education possible, but often it produces pugnaciousness, assertiveness, bad manners. This in turn produces irritation in the white man, and so the vicious circle continues unbroken.

Another evil result of customs designed to make the Negro feel inferior is that they encourage white people to dote upon their "superiority" and to take advantage of people unable to defend themselves. The white people of the South are the victims of their own defense pattern, for in the effort to assert their superiority they not only develop a dangerous egotism, but they come near to sadism, a psychopathic condition in which a person takes pleasure in inflicting pain upon another.

Another evil of these customs is the split personality type that they foster. The Negro in the typical Southern community lives in two worlds and is forced to adapt his thoughts, his speech, and his conduct to these two worlds. One of the worlds is his world in which he is a self-respecting man; the other is the white man's world in which he is a hypocrite. The community pattern also fosters dualistic per-

sonality traits in the white man. The white individual must act in one way towards the white man, in another way towards the Negro. The manner in which he acts towards the Negro is often in conflict with the higher standard of relationships he knows to be right in his dealing with his fellow man, but he is forced by the community pattern, even when he feels that it is wrong, to make an exception of the Negro in his application of the ethical standards he knows in his heart is right. This is bound to be hurtful to his character development. Often, too, the white man will assent to some expression of community resentment, such as mob violence, when his conscience rebels against assent, because it is easier to conform than to protest. No white man can come through such an experience with his self-respect intact.

3. The Minister's Responsibility to the Community

The minister, when he considers these things, realizes that he must go beyond dealing with individuals in his effort to find a better way in race relations. He cannot forget that his young people must be brought up in a community composed of people and institutions that are both good and bad. The minister can no more ignore the evils of race prejudice than he can ignore barrooms and brothels. It is the duty of the minister, therefore, to search out the causes of racial ill will in his community and seek the remedies for them. There are many of these causes that are not beyond treatment and removal. Some of these are mistreatment of Negroes by police officers, discrimination against Negroes in the distribution of public funds and in the creation of parks and playgrounds, poor health facilities and hospitals for Negroes, disfranchisement of Negroes, bad treatment of Negroes on street cars and busses, and poor housing conditions among the colored people. All of these causes of ill-will result from the white man's prejudices.

The Negro has his failings, too, and it is well for the Negro minister to remember this and realize that the Negro group must shoulder a portion of the responsibility for creating a healthy community spirit. Resentment on the Negro's part must be dealt with if progress is to be made. Negroes must be taught by their ministers that cooperation between

the races is essential to improvement of the Negro's status and that good-will on the part of the Negro, as well as the white man, is the foundation of cooperation.

4. The Minister at Work on the Problem

In the light of the baneful effects of racial tension on individuals and community alike, it is difficult to see how the minister can escape feeling some responsibility for the racial situation in his community. Recent developments in the South show that an increasing number of ministers are accepting responsibility for solution of the race problem, but thousands of ministers have failed to develop a sense of stewardship in this matter; scores of others have a sincere desire "to do something" but do not know what to do. Only the minister who has lived and served in a Southern community can fully appreciate the problems that confront one who undertakes to improve the racial situation in his community. But these problems are not insoluble, and they should not deter the minister from accepting a stewardship that is rightfully his.

Every community presents its own peculiar problems and no set of rules can be rigidly applied, but certain general principles can be applied in almost all communities. These are offered as suggestions to ministers who want to have a share in bringing about a better day in the South.

1. Let the minister prepare himself. By self-examination and prayer let the minister discover and conquer all race prejudice that may exist in his own heart. After his own "conversion" is complete, let him educate himself about the race problem. Let him read not only the best books on race, but books on the Negro and Negro culture. Let him read the poems, novels, and dramas written by Negro men of letters.

2. Let him cooperate personally with Negro leaders. One of the first steps in improving the racial situation in a community is the development of friendly relations between leaders in the white and Negro groups. The white minister should seek out the Negro minister and establish fraternal and co-operative relationship with him. Such a relationship will provide for the white minister a source of information

concerning the mind of the Negro, what he thinks and what he wants; it will afford a helpful beginning of co-operation.

3. Let him study the local situation. The minister who wishes to do something about the race problem in his own community must know from observation and experience what the situation is. He should find out how the Negro population lives and what Negroes' grievances are. He should find answers to these questions: How are Negroes treated by the police and law enforcement officials? How are they treated on street cars and busses? What proportion of school funds do they receive for their schools? Are their schools adequate and are their teachers justly paid? Are the Negroes provided with public parks and playgrounds? What are the health conditions among the Negroes? What are the needs of the Negro churches? Other questions will suggest themselves, and every answer may uncover a cause of racial tension.

4. Let the minister enlist the people of his own church in his effort. This step of course will test his wisdom, courage, and patience. Let him lead his people to know the facts before he preaches at them. Let him present the needs of a local Negro church and enlist the co-operation of several of his organizations in aiding this church in a building program, or in a training course, or the like. In the course of such a program the colored minister may be invited to speak before groups in the white church, and thus the way may be paved for interracial co-operation. Groups from the white church should visit Negro churches and centers to learn by personal observation the needs of the Negro community. When by such personal experience the needs of the Negro community have come to be generally recognized, the white minister may then speak effectively from the pulpit on the subject of race prejudice and may present the Christian answer to the problem.

5. Let the minister accept the responsibility of serving his community as a prophet and priest of Christian love and justice. If the people of his church and commnity are guilty of the sin of prejudice he must for their sakes and in fidelity to the gospel point out the sin and reveal the way of love. With courage, and yet always in love, he must denounce injustice.

5. A Charter on Race Relations

A special committee of the Southern Baptist Convention formulated for submission to the Convention a charter on race relations to serve as a guide for Southern white Baptists. The charter contains a series of "principles of conduct" which well may be used by ministers in presenting to their people a practical course of action. They follow:

1. We shall think of the Negro as a person and treat him accordingly.

2. We shall continually strive as individuals to conquer all prejudice and eliminate from our speech terms of contempt and from our conduct actions of ill-will.

3. We shall teach our children that prejudice is un-Christian and that good-will and helpful deeds are the duty of every Christian toward all men of all races.

4. We shall protest against injustice and indignities against Negroes, as we do in the case of people of our own race, whenever and wherever we meet them.

5. We shall be willing for the Negro to enjoy the rights granted to him under the Constitution of the United States, including the right to vote, to serve on juries, to receive justice in the courts, to be free from mob violence, to secure a just share of the benefits of educational and other funds, and to receive equal service for equal payment on public carriers and conveniences.

6. We shall be just in our dealing with the Negro as an individual. Whenever he is in our employ we shall pay him an adequate wage and provide for him healthful working conditions.

7. We shall strive to promote community good-will between the races in every way possible.

8. We shall actively co-operate with Negro Baptists in the building up of their churches, the education of their ministers, and the promotion of their missions and evangelistic programs.

The Christian minister dare not excuse himself from following these principles. Indifference is gross sin. Should he fail in some of his objectives, he may have the satisfaction of a good conscience as he seeks to apply the gospel to the race problem.

A Study In Denominationalism

William W. Barnes

IT has been said that "Southern Baptists are the problem child of Protestantism." The intense denominational consciousness of Southern Baptists is both the result of preceding conditions, doctrinal and historical, and the cause for the methods of work adopted, which in turn have deepened the denominational consciousness. Among the large denominational groups in America perhaps the only parallel in denominational intensity is found in Roman Catholics.

The roots of this denominational intensity may be found in the historical background of Baptists in the South. There are features in the ecclesiology, in the historical conditions in the South, in the method of work of Southern Baptists and in the conduct of that work which have brought about the development of the current denominational outlook.

I. Ecclesiology

Three distinct Baptist types have mingled together and formed the great stream of Southern Baptist history. Two of those originated in England, the third arose in America.

1. *Particular Baptists.* The Particular or Calvinistic Baptists come to the surface in the foment in the England of the early seventeenth century. They began in the 1640's to set forth to the world their doctrinal views. In the final form of their confessional statement (1689) they have this to say: "Chapter 26. 1. The Catholick or universal Church, which may be called invisible, consists of the whole number of the Elect, that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ the head thereof; and is the spouse, the body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.

"2. All persons throughout the world, professing the faith of the Gospel, and obedience to God by Christ, according to it, not destroying their own profession by any Errors everting the foundation, or unholyness of conversation, are and may be called visible Saints; and of such ought all Particular Congregations to be constituted."

This Assembly Confession was adopted by the Philadel-

phia Association in 1742 with two articles on the singing of Psalms and on the laying on of hands taken from Benjamin Keach's Confession. In America this is known as the Philadelphia Confession and came to be the standard confession of the early churches and associations from Philadelphia southward. It will be seen that in the thinking of those Baptists influenced by the Philadelphia Confession there is the acknowledgement of the body of Christ called the Church. Gradually through the decades that body of Christ was thought of as visibly expressed in the larger denominational bodies which ultimately came to be associated in a national body.

2. *General Baptists.* The General or Arminian Baptists also began to set forth their doctrinal position in order to show the government of Charles II, as well as leaders in the Church of England, that they held distinct Christian views. In their confessional statement of 1678 they have this to say: Article 29. "There is one holy catholick church consisting of, or made up of the whole number of the elect, that have been, are, or shall be gathered, in one body under Christ, the only head thereof." In Article 30 they say: "Nevertheless, we believe the visible church of Christ on earth, is made up of several distinct congregations, which make up that one catholick church or mystical body of Christ." In Article 39 they have this to say of denominational organizations: "General councils, or assemblies, consisting of Bishops, Elders, and Brethren, of the several churches of Christ, and being legally convened, and met together out of all the churches, and the churches appearing there by their representatives, make but one church, and have lawful right, and suffrage in this general meeting, or assembly, to act in the name of Christ; it being of divine authority, and is the best means under heaven to preserve unity, to prevent heresy, and superintendency among, or in any congregation whatsoever within its own limits, or jurisdiction. And to such a meeting, or assembly, appeals ought to be made, in case any injustice be done, or heresy, and schism countenanced, in any particular congregation of Christ, and the decisive voice in such general assemblies is the major part, and such general assemblies have lawful power to hear, and determine, as also to excommunicate."

These General Baptists of England were the first to appear in Virginia and North Carolina. It is probable that General Baptists were among those who appeared in South Carolina in 1683. At any rate, some years later there was a division in the Charleston church over questions of Calvinism and Arminianism. From Virginia and North Carolina an appeal was sent to the General Assembly of General Baptists in England for ministers and books to be sent them. This appeal appears in the Minutes of the General Assembly of 1702. In view of the difficulties of ocean travel in those days the probability is that these General Baptists appeared in North Carolina before 1700, seemingly confirming the statement of Hawkes, the Episcopal historian of North Carolina, that there were Baptists in North Carolina as early as 1695. The ecclesiology of the General Baptists of England appears several decades later in the associational life of North Carolina and Virginia.

3. *Separate Baptists.* Separate Baptists arose out of the Great Awakening in New England. They found their greatest expression south of the Potomac. In 1754 a church was gathered at Sandy Creek, Randolph County, North Carolina, consisting of sixteen members. The group was led by the two great leaders, Shubael Stearnes and Daniel Marshall, brothers-in-law. Marshall later went to Georgia and laid the foundations of Baptist work there. In 1758 the Sandy Creek Association was formed. The work and churches of this association extended from the Potomac into Georgia, from the sea-coast into the mountains. Preachers and other members moved westward and began Baptist work in east and central Tennessee, and in southern and central Kentucky.

Stearnes and Marshall came out of the Congregational Church in Connecticut which had closely approximated the Presbyterian church polity. They evidently brought over into their Baptist life elements of connectionalism from the semi-Presbyterianism of their previous life. Morgan Edwards says of the Sandy Creek Association (1771): "They had carried matters so high as to leave hardly any power in particular churches, unfellowshipping ordinations, ministers and churches that acted independent of them; and pleading 'That though compleat power be in every church, yet every church can transfer it to an association'."

These three types of Baptists met and mingled in Virginia, the Carolinas and Georgia. By missionary activities and immigration they were extended to the Mississippi River and ultimately into the Southwest. The Particular Baptists set forth the thought of a spiritual body of Christ. The General Baptists' ecclesiology contributed the thought that that spiritual body of Christ takes visible expression in general organizations with "Bishops or Messengers" who functioned as Executive Secretaries. The Separate Baptists furnished the missionary and evangelistic zeal directed by centralized authority into the far reaches of the South and Southwest. The Separate Baptists in Virginia for a period of two years had Apostles, who functioned as Bishops.

II. Historical Conditions in the South

Christianity may be compared to a long river flowing through a continent. The water takes the color of the soil through which it flows. Secular conditions—political, economic, social and intellectual—give color to Christian thinking through the centuries. From the beginning of our civilization in the South down to the present day the Southern states constitute a distinct entity in America.

1. The civilization that developed in the South in the antebellum period assumed a semi-feudal character. Much of the political thinking was influenced by the aristocratic atmosphere of England. In England after the Norman conquest the aristocratic life of the nation was founded on land-tenure. From the beginning of English civilization in the South land-holding was counted the basis of the highest social class. The large land-holding element dominated political thinking. As a consequence, the political life in the South was not so democratic as in the North, particularly in New England. In regard to Virginia that situation is well set forth by Thomas Jefferson in a letter to Samuel Kercheval, July 12, 1816, in answer to a letter of inquiry to Jefferson from Kercheval. There was agitation for re-writing the Virginia constitution along more democratic lines. The letter is too long to quote in full, but all of it must be read in order to get Jefferson's picture of the lack of democracy in Virginia. A few quotations must suffice. "In the legislature the House of Representatives

is chosen by less than half the people and not at all in proportion to those who do choose. The Senate are still more disproportionate and for long terms of irresponsibility. In the Executive the Governor is entirely independent of the choice of the people and their control; his Council equally so and at best but a fifth wheel to a wagon. In the judiciary the judges of the highest courts are dependent on none but themselves. . . . They are irremovable but by their own body. . . . The justices of the inferior courts are self-chosen, are for life, and perpetuate their own body in succession forever. . . . Yet these justices are the executives as well as the judiciary in all minor and most ordinary concerns. They tax us at will; fill the office of sheriff. . . . ; name nearly all our military, which leaders once named are removable but by themselves. The juries, our judges of all fact, and of law when they choose it are not selected by the people, nor amenable to them." Jefferson goes on to suggest what changes ought to be made in order to make the government democratic and responsible to the people. He sets forth the New England political setup: "These wards, called townships in New England, are the vital principles of their governments and have proved themselves the wisest invention ever devised by the wit of man for the perfect exercise of self-government and for its preservation."

The Baptist thinking in the South was influenced by this political atmosphere. Baptist leaders such as Richard Furman of South Carolina and his disciple and successor, W. B. Johnson, Jesse Mercer of Georgia, less known leaders in North Carolina and in Virginia, even J. R. Graves of Tennessee (supposed to be the patron saint of the local idea in the word church), spoke frequently of the *Baptist Church* or the *American Baptist Church* or the *Baptist Church in Tennessee* or *our Church*. In the closing decade of the eighteenth century and the first three decades of the nineteenth century leaders such as Furman and Johnson, with an occasional sympathizer in New England, such as Thomas Baldwin, endeavored to form an ecclesiastical organization including all of the Baptist churches of the United States. Their general plan was set forth by Luther Rice in 1814 when he was endeavoring to organize American Baptists for the foreign mission project in Burma. The general outline was as follows: churches grouped

in associations, the associations grouped in state bodies, the state bodies grouped in a national body, all-comprehensive in scope and types of work.

It is quite apparent that the ecclesiological ideas set forth by the three types of Baptists already mentioned easily combined with the political ideas in the South looking toward a centralized body of Baptists.

2. In the post-bellum period the secular conditions intensified conditions already existing. The reconstruction program of the Federal government forced the South to build around itself a wall of defense within which we are still living. The post-war struggle to preserve white civilization in the South against the carpet baggers and scalawags has influenced the South to continue a political entity of itself and to think in terms of a secluded life. This atmosphere reacted on Baptist thinking and has influenced Southern Baptists to turn in on themselves and form a solidarity not known among Baptists in any other geographical unit.

3. There was a third historical situation more specifically ecclesiastical that entered into the picture. In 1851 J. R. Graves began that High Church movement among Southern Baptists known as *Landmarkism*. By 1860 it was in full stride. After the war it furnished to Baptist life the ecclesiastical counterpart of the politically secluded life of the South. In 1906 a large group west of the Mississippi River withdrew from the Southern Convention on ecclesiastical grounds and took the *name* with them, but much of the *influence* of Landmarkism abides in the Convention.

III. Methods of Denominational Work

There have been and are two distinct methods among Baptists for conducting missions, education, and benevolence. These methods have been adopted because of the differences in ecclesiology already indicated and because of the difficulties involved in bringing thousands of local congregations into a large cooperative organization—large in geographical area and large in objective.

1. The first method may be called the *Society method.* When cooperative work in foreign missions was called for after the conversion of Rice and Judson to Baptist views

Southern Baptist leaders desired to form an all-comprehensive national ecclesiastical body to carry on foreign mission work, home mission work, and ministerial training. From Philadelphia northward the predominant objective was a group usually called a society organized for each particular phase of work. The compromise at Philadelphia in 1814 resulted in the General Convention for Foreign Missions. The New Englanders with their emphasis upon the local church insisted upon a Foreign Mission Society. The Southerners with their conception of a larger ecclesiastical body insisted upon a convention to do every sort of denominational work. The name *convention* was selected, but its function in 1814 was limited to foreign missions. From 1814 to 1832 the endeavor was made to enlarge the scope of the General Convention. In 1824 the Tract Society (later called Publication Society) was formed. In 1832 the Home Mission Society was formed. From then on the society method seemed to have been accepted without further struggle.

2. The second method of carrying on denominational work I call the *Convention method.* The Convention method postulates a denominational organization called a convention with a Board appointed to have charge of each particular line of work, appointed by the convention, responsible to the convention, and making periodical reports to the convention. *It may be easily seen that if and when such a convention is formed there may not be any limit to the development of centralization.*

When the abolition issue arose a crisis developed in the General Convention (foreign missions) and in the Home Mission Society. Out of that crisis the Southern Baptist Convention was formed. With the representation at Augusta in 1845 composed of Southerners only the long-time Southern conception of ecclesiology had a chance to express itself. Under the leadership of W. B. Johnson, the heir to the ideas of Richard Furman, the Southern Baptist Convention was formed, on this all-comprehensive basis. The Fifth Article of the Constitution states that "The Convention shall elect at each triennial meeting as many Boards of Managers, as in its judgment will be necessary for carrying out the benevolent objects it may determine to promote." At the time, only

two boards were set up, the Foreign Mission Board and the Domestic Mission Board, but under its Constitution from the beginning the Southern Convention might enter into any line of work it may choose. Through the century of its existence the Convention has gradually enlarged its work in the direction of benevolence and education until it seemed that the Convention had gone beyond its legal authority granted in the charter of 1845. Therefore, the Georgia legislature was requested to re-interpret the charter in terms of larger powers. In 1943 the Georgia legislature passed and the Governor signed *An Enabling Act* granting any eleemosynary or religious corporation heretofore created in Georgia, or hereafter to be created, further powers. Under that Act everything the Southern Convention now is doing or may do is specified, and after everything to be thought of has been specified then the Act says: "And further to do any and every thing necessary and proper for the accomplishment of the objects herein enumerated and in general to carry on any lawful business necessary or incident to the attainment of these objects."

Thus the pre-existing ideas of ecclesiology and the legal authorization have combined to give the Southern Baptist Convention authority to do anything and everything the Convention sees fit to do.

There is one further ecclesiastical development yet to come to full growth. Are our denominational bodies courts of appeal from lower bodies? That development has not yet taken place, but the movement is on the way. In 1926 an amendment to the Constitution of the Southern Baptist Convention was proposed which, in substance, provided that no one could be a member of the Southern Baptist Convention who had been denied membership in a state or an associational body. The proposed amendment was referred to a committee. This writer called the attention of two or three prominent leaders of the Convention to the danger involved in making the Southern Convention a court of appeal from lower bodies. The proposed amendment died in committee, no further report having been made. But in 1928 such an amendment was added to the Constitution of the Baptist General Convention of Texas. This change did not specifically make

the Baptist General Convention a court of appeal from the action of any association in Texas in which anyone was denied membership, but the door was cracked open. The right to approve the action of an association in denying anyone a seat involves the right to disapprove. The General Convention, rather the enrolling clerk, did exercise the alternative right in 1933 and seated messengers from a newly organized church in Fort Worth which had been denied representation in the Tarrant County Association. When the new Constitution was written, in the endeavor to unite the Baptist General Convention and the Baptist Missionary Association, 1935, that proviso was not included; but in 1946 it was proposed at the meeting of the Baptist General Convention to amend Section 1 of Article III of the Constitution to read as follows: "This body in all its meetings shall be composed of messengers elected by regular missionary Baptist Churches that are in voluntary cooperation and fellowship with other churches in like faith in their respective associations for the work and purpose set forth in Article III of this Constitution." The Recording Secretary placed a note after this item in the Minutes to the effect that this proposed amendment was never voted on by the Convention. The fact that the amendment was proposed indicates that such thinking is current among us. Our people are thinking in terms of a closely articulated denominational system; that is to say, that a church should be affiliated with an association in order that it may be represented in the state body and likewise that such state representation is prerequisite to representation in the Southern Baptist Convention. Such development has not come, but the thinking is in that direction.

Thus it may be seen that out of the historical background of ideas of ecclesiology in the first century and a half of Southern Baptist life, influenced by external secular circumstances and developed in the process of actual administration of the work of the Convention, further intensified by controversies, more or less bitter, that have arisen particularly in the Southwest, there has gone far a development toward centralized thinking and administration. If the history of the past two hundred years indicates any direction for the future, a developed ecclesiastical system is on the way.

"Thy Kingdom Come"

Rev. C. S. Gardner, D.D.

"Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say."—Luke 6:46

THE Kingdom of God is a concept which no age has adequately understood. But the enlarging experience of the human race reveals new depths of riches in it. I do not now profess to comprehend it in all the wealth of its implications. But there are certain phases of its meaning, answering the needs of our present-day life, which I wish to state.

It is an ideal system of personal relationships centering in the Supreme Person, God. One cannot read the words of Jesus without being impressed with the fact that the one significant thing in this universe to Him is personality, and its realization in the relation of persons to one another. The one enterprise of God is the building up of ideal relations between men, perfected through their relations to God; or to reverse the statement, the establishment of perfect relations between men and God, manifested and realized in ideal relations among men. The real business of God is not the building of a material universe, magnificent as that is. Plants, animals, rivers, plains and hills, seas and continents, planets and suns, all are glorious to contemplate, and body forth the richness of His thought and the vastness of His power. But that is only scaffolding for the real structure which God is erecting—a divine human organization of persons—before the glory of which the wonders of the material universe become commonplace.

The principle of this divine-human organization of persons is love. Genuine righteousness, positive righteousness, is only the practice of love—the love of one's neighbor as one's self, perfected in their loving loyalty to God, who is the central person in this system of righteousness. To organize this divine system of personal relationships was the mission of Jesus Christ in this world. For this He taught, lived, and died. For this He ever lives again. For this He bids His fol-

lowers labor and toil and spend their lives. This is the divine enterprise. Its fulfillment is the goal of the whole creative process which started when the original chaos of matter began its development into a Cosmos; and will end only when the chaos of the moral universe shall, through the energy of the same Spirit, evolve into a moral Cosmos.

Wherever, then, the relations of men to God are not right, wherever the relations of men to men are not right, there is a task for the Kingdom. There we should be working for the Kingdom to come.

First among the instrumentalities for its realization is the church. This is the instrument created especially for building the Kingdom. Two dangerous errors are to be guarded against here. One is the false idea that the church, the specific religious institution, is not needed. A churchless Christianity could never have won a hearing from the reluctant ears of men, nor brought their rebellious hearts to capitulation, nor uprooted ideas and codes, nor destroyed social institutions which were hoary with age and fortified with material power. For such tasks the Kingdom needed an effective instrument, and that instrument was, and still is, a church.

A second error is the false idea that the church is identical with the Kingdom. This is the principle of the Roman perversion of religion. There is ever present in human nature a tendency to attach to the means the value which belongs only to the end. And whenever this takes place, the real end is lost sight of and there results a ruinous inversion of values. The means, having absorbed the value of the end, is no longer instrumental to that end, but becomes the most effective obstruction of it. And so the ecclesiastical organization, when it becomes an end in itself, obstructs the progress of the Kingdom.

In addition to the church, the Kingdom, as it progresses, creates other subsidiary organs. Many forms of healthful activity for the uplift of men spring up and prove to be more or less efficient as instruments for the realization of the broad purposes of Jesus Christ. Moreover, as the Kingdom grows, it pervades the whole life of man, penetrates and dominates, uses more and more the organs of individual and collective life. As the process goes on, all forms of activity, all institu-

tions, fall gradually under the sway of the King, do their work more and more in His spirit and become instrumental in building up the Kingdom. It is like the spread of a conflagration. The church is the lighted torch that starts the fire here and there and yonder. But as one great structure after another is wrapped in flames, it becomes a center of propagation and flings its sparks upon the disseminating winds. But this is a figure of destruction. The church is perhaps more like a spiritual battery which maintains itself distinct from other institutions, but charges them with its ideals, and they thus become centers of moral energy and radiate ethical and spiritual power. They are first mastered by the Kingdom, and then used, each according to its own nature and function, as instruments for its propagation.

Broadly speaking, there are two methods by which the Kingdom grows. The first is evangelization, the bringing of men into the Kingdom. The first step is, of necessity, to bring men into allegiance to the King: to naturalize them, so to speak, as his subjects. Or, if we think of the process in educational terms, as Jesus seemed to be doing when He gave the great commission, men must first be enrolled in the school of Christ, made disciples, before the process of instruction can proceed. Instruction and training must precede the great hour when the individual will, having been enlightened as to its fundamental obligations to God and men, reaches, through the operation of the divine Spirit, a personal decision to obey God and live for others. This education leading to decision is the initial step in the building of the Kingdom.

Then there is a second step, namely, the reorganization of society. In any deliberate, systematic attempt to reorganize social ideals and social institutions one must begin with individuals. The individual is the point of emphasis, of acute accent, in the whole scheme of Jesus. Individuals alone have souls. Only in the individual is consciousness found. Apart from the individual consciousness, society is merely an abstraction. Apart from individual consciousness, an institution cannot be happy or miserable, cannot perceive and appreciate the difference between right and wrong, cannot have ideals, cannot be saved or lost, cannot have any experience at all. The individual is the unit of value in the divine scheme of

life. What are called social values, social realities of any kind, have meaning only as they are registered in the consciousness of individuals. But nobody has ever realized more distinctly and intensely than our Lord that you cannot deal intelligently and effectively with the individual without affecting the social group and the social order of which he is a member, and it is perfectly patent to the student of His teaching and life that His plan includes in its scope both the regeneration of the individual and the transformation of the social order.

One enters the Kingdom when he accepts Jesus as Lord. But is that all? Is the matter settled by the simple acknowledgement of the Lordship of Jesus? With something of fine scorn He says: "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" It is not the unctuous declaration of His Lordship for which He is concerned. He is not interested in titles. Least of all is He ambitious to wear them and exploit them. How pitifully inadequate are our verbal ascriptions of honor! What he seeks is something far more real; namely, to get certain things done, to have his followers actually do the will of God in all their human relations, to embody the principle of righteousness—the practice of love—in all their lives; and this leads straight to the reorganization of human society. The evangelization which does not become social transformation is abortive, because it amounts to nothing more than the multiplication of those who say, "Lord, Lord" and do not the things which He says.

Nor is it the theoretical demonstration of His Lordship for which He is solicitious. I am far from disparaging the efforts of those who are giving energy and thought to the vindication of the Lordship of Jesus on theological grounds. There is no question but that modern philosophy has made necessary such a defense of our historic Christology. But as I see it, the fundamental need today is not the vindication of the position of Jesus in a metaphysical conception of the universe. It is rather the practical vindication of His supremacy in the sphere of human conduct, in the realm of social relations. It is not the shouting of "Lord, Lord," either in the tones of pious rhapsody or in the learned terminology of the schools, but it is the doing of what He says in all the

spheres and relationships of life. If we refuse to see, are too timid to assert the plain social implications of our religion; if we are lacking in the spiritual nerve to make a bold application of the principles of the Kingdom of God to the spheres of politics and economics, we stand by consenting while the crown is taken from the brow of Jesus Christ. Nor can we avert the deep disgrace of this treasonable acquiescence by making more vociferous our cries of "Lord, Lord."

We are living a highly differentiated life today. Our activities are divided up into clearly distinguished segments. The same person is a domestic man, a political man, an economic man, a religious man, etc. Each of these main sections of his life is subdivided into an indefinite number of smaller sections. Many men are trying to live according to one standard in one section of their lives and other standards in other sections.

Hence you see the double standard, or rather multiple standard of conduct in many lives. The situation affords an ample opportunity to ease our conscience by cutting out great sections of life and setting them aside as spheres in which religion is not expected to operate; in which the ethics of Jesus do not apply; which are not included within the rule of the Kingdom of God. And when men begin this practice of excluding sections of life from the rule of the Kingdom they always exclude from the religious jurisdiction activities in which they are deeply and practically interested, which absorb the greater portion of their time and energy. Over the continents of life they unfurl the flag of the secular—a vast domain which is to be governed by the ancient law of "Every man for himself," a law copied from the brute world, but dignified as the vital principle of economic and political life. On a few detached and rocky islands, situated in the stormy seas, they erect the flag of religion. They consent that the whole of that heavenly world, about which they have no very distinct ideas except that no millions are there to be won, and no political offices and plunder are for sale, may be turned over to the practice of the principles of Christ.

The greatest of all heresies is this practice of running an imaginary line across life and placing its divisions under different sovereignties. We are told that religion has no

authority to speak on the economic and political problems that are shaking our social order down to its foundations: that the proper sphere for its sway lies elsewhere. But if we accept such a superficial and arbitrary splitting of our lives into unrelated fractions and withdraw to the side of life which is technically called religious, the problem only takes a different form and attacks us in our fancied seclusion. For economic and political difficulties project their disturbing influences across the line into the area reserved for religion and play havoc with the spiritual power and efficiency and peace of the churches. It is not a religious matter, we are told. But nevertheless the economic and political evils of our time are sweeping great masses of the people out of the churches, and alienating from organized religion the very elements of the population which flocked around Jesus and responded to his gracious words.

Or the effort is made to set apart a specific religious area in life by applying another principle of division. A man's life is made up on the one hand of simple personal, individual contacts and relations with his fellows; and, on the other hand, of corporate, institutional relations. In the one set of relations his life is not organized. He is just a man among his fellows. In the other his life is organized as a part of a system. He is dove-tailed into a more or less rigid social order. On the one side is free personal life; on the other is institutional life, in which he is not free. Now, there is a tendency to regard the principles of Christianity as applicable only in free personal relations. There are many men who live by different standards in these departments of action. They will do things as members of a corporation or institution which they would by no means consent to do as individual men dealing with their fellows. Institutional or corporate action is not subject to the law of Christ. According to this view, corporations have no souls. Institutions are non-moral entities; they are not included in the scope of the Kingdom of God.

Away with such subterfuges! A corporation has as many souls as there are individuals in the corporation. The extension of the dominion of the Kingdom of God over these corporations is one of the great religious tasks of our time.

("Thy Kingdom Come" will be continued in the June CHRISTIAN FRONTIERS.)

BOOKS

SOME MORE MUST READING

W. W. FINLATOR

"The most important publication of 1946" was the publisher's statement accompanying the release of *The Revised Standard Version of the New Testament.* In a moment of reckless enthusiasm one is tempted to predict that the Interseminary Series will prove to be the most important religious publication in 1947. In these volumes is laid the groundwork of study for a conference of students and professors from 125 American theological seminaries to be held at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, in June. Written in collaboration by 34 of the most eminent theological scholars the Interseminary Series represents a comprehensive coming-to-grasp with the task, nature and message of the Church in the modern world. "Each of these volumes," according to the *Christian Century,* "is the product of the collective thinking of a large and representative commission and is a symposium of chapters by a dozen or more writers. The list of authors reads like a who's who among American religious thinkers, with the younger element somewhat more prominently represented, as it should be. . . . [The Series] is the intellectual foundation of a movement which should be much in the minds of thinking people during the next twelve months." The first volume deals with the "challenge of our culture" and "the church and organized movements." The second volume discusses "the gospel, the church and the world" and "ecumenical Christianity." For all for whom the preaching of the gospel in our day requires deep and clear thinking here is a "must." And here too can be an experience like Keats' when he first looked into Chapman's Homer. New galaxies of religious thought and challenge will swim into the reader's ken.

Christian Faith and My Job, Alexander Miller, New York, Association Press, 1946, 60 pages, $1.00.

The colleges of America are faced with crucial problems due to overcrowded facilities and increased enrollments. Under the "G.I. Bill" many veterans are pursuing college courses who otherwise would not have done so. What the colleges face today, the communities of America must face tomorrow. These young men and women who graduate will be returning home with college degrees, which for many will represent a special kind of license to the most desirable jobs in the community. The class and caste system of the average Southern town will be subject to severe strains.

Traveling through New England, one is delighted to drive up to a garage and, in conversation, discover that the mechanic working on the spare-tire is a graduate of Amherst, a member of the local Town Meeting, a Rotarian, and Chairman of the Hospital Board. The average Southern town would be surprised by the college graduate who chose to

work as a mechanic. It would be expected that he return to publish the local newspaper or establish a jewelry shop. How can we provide significant status to all vocational choices so that these graduates can work where they are best fitted vocationally, and still render significant leadership in the community?

The problem, of course, has two facets: one, how is one to choose a vocation? and two, how can society adjust its attitudes toward the choice? In *Christian Faith and My Job,* Alexander Miller discusses these two aspects of the problem. The book is an attempt "To relate the Christian Understanding of life in the world to the problems of personal conduct in an industrialized, highly competitive, and often immoral society."

It is a failure of the Christian Church that the term "Christian Vocation" has been used almost exclusively to mean a missionary, a preacher, or a teacher of religion. The average Church has spent little time evaluating the "Christian Vocation" involved in weaving cloth, making a shirt, and marketing a shirt. Miller's attempt to show how the claim of Christ is related to all of life will be a good corrective to much of our incomplete Christian teaching regarding the significance of vocational choice.

"Any serious acceptance of the claim of Christ will mean that we let him choose our job for us," and "Every Christian brings an acceptable offering to God, whether it be in the common worship of the people or in the work of their hands. And just as their prayers are acceptable to God equally with those of the minister, so the work of their hands—be it making or mending, tilling or building, teaching children or administering justice —is acceptable to God."

Here are sixty pages that will be an answer to prayer for those interested in either helping a young person select a job, or revealing to a congregation the deeper meaning of Christian community.

On Final Ground.
By Harold A. Bosley.
New York.
Harper and Brothers, 1946.
pp. 260. Sermons. $2.

Can it be that these 22 sermons are typical of the preaching of Harold A. Bosley? Are these the kind of sermons that go out from the pulpit of the Mount Vernon Place Methodist Church in Baltimore from Sunday to Sunday? If so, then Baltimore can take it! For here is no infant diet of milk, but solid meat.

There are two sermons on the authority of the Bible, two on the authority of Jesus Christ, two on the authority of the church; three on prayer, plus "God the Distant Drummer," "Where Judgment Begins," "New Devils for Old," "If Anywhere, Then Everywhere," "Preaching Where the Ways Part," and eight others.

This is preaching addressed to man as a rational human being. If one comes looking for clarity of analysis, then he will be well rewarded. J. Winston Pearce

NEWS

FLORIDA CHURCHMEN PROTEST WHITE PRIMARY LEGISLATION

Winter Park (RNS)—Vigorous protest against proposed "white primary" legislation for Florida was voiced by a state-wide meeting here under auspices of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

Some 250 leaders in church, labor, educational, veterans, and other groups throughout the state adopted unanimously a resolution opposing "wholeheartedly the unscientific, irreligious and un-American fallacy that Government can be improved by denying to any group of citizens the right to vote on the basis of race, color, creed or economic status."

"The issue is not one of black or white supremacy, but one of the supremacy of right," declared the Rev. Daniel C. Whitsett, pastor, First Methodist church, Marianna, and chairman of the meeting.

Dr. Hamilton Holt, president of Rollins College, told the group that "we do not need the white primary in Florida" or in any other part of the United States where politicians are "trying to get around the clear-cut decision of the Supreme Court of the United States" against such measures.

The Rev. Louis Schulz, pastor of the Congregational church here, warned that removal of primaries from state supervision "would mean that Florida was succumbing with Georgia and Mississippi to the fascist program of Talmadge and Bilbo."

Describing the bill which State Senator John E. Matthews is to introduce in the Florida Legislature, convening April 8, as a "basic threat to democracy and Christian values," Dr. James A. Dombrowski, New Orleans, administrator of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, insisted that there should be no restrictions on voting other than citizenship.

A committee called the "Conference for Human Welfare, in-Florida" was set up to work against the Jim Crow measure in each of the six Congressional districts in the state.

PAROCHIAL SCHOOL AGAIN!

Franklin, N. H. (RNS)—A recommendation that this community make public-school textbooks available to parochial school pupils has been presented here by Eugene S. Daniells, Jr., local attorney.

Mr. Daniells said he based his proposal on the recent Supreme Court decision which ruled that New Jersey can use public funds to transport parochial school children, and on a Louisiana decision permitting textbooks to be furnished to private school students out of tax revenues.

Mayor Henry J. Proulď, in reply, said the public school system here has no provision for such an item in its budget. He added, however, he thought it possible for the Franklin City Council to make textbooks available to parochial schools without a decision from the state legislature.

The mayor pointed out that transportation of parochial school pupils at public expense is already provided for here and is common practice under a state law passed several years ago.

PENNA. BAPTISTS INVITE NEGROES TO FULL FELLOWSHIP

Philadelphia (RNS)—The Pennsylvania Baptist Convention has invited Negro Baptist churches all over the state "to full membership and fellowship" in the Convention's various associations.

The invitation was extended through the Rev. Edwin H. Frey, of Bethlehem, Pa., chairman of the Christian Friendliness Committee of the Convention. Baptist associations have been asked to invite their Negro co-religionists to share committee responsibilities.

PRIEST CONDEMNS LEGISLATION TO OUTLAW CLOSED SHOP

Boston (RNS) — Joining with the C.I.O. and A.F. of L. in their stand, the Rev. Thomas E. Shortell, S.J., of Holy Cross College, public representative of Governor Bradford's committee on labor management relations, condemned legislation to outlaw the closed shop in union contracts.

"The bargaining down of wages will result in lower living standards and lower productive output because of increased strife between union and non-union members," he told the committee on labor and industries of the Massachusetts legislature.

Father Shortell suggested that the enemies of labor would do the public a service if they devoted less time and money to fighting the trade union movement and more to promoting labor-management understanding. He pointed to England and Sweden as countries where labor-management understanding has prospered.

BAPTISTS SEEK TO MAINTAIN CHURCH-STATE SEPARATION

Birmingham, Ala. (RNS)—The Birmingham Baptist Pastors' Conference went on record here as favoring a national organization to "combat every attempt to invalidate the American Bill of Rights and its corollary, the separation of church and state."

The pastors requested the Baptist Joint Conference Committee on Public Relations "to approach the Federal Council of Churches and all Protestant denominations, the Jews, the Masons and other groups," regarding formation of such a national organization.

SOUTH CAROLINIANS TO VOTE ON DIVORCE BAN

Columbia, S. C. (RNS)—South Carolinians will vote in a referendum in 1948 on whether the state's 50-year ban on divorce will be removed by constitutional amendment.

The general assembly has passed a concurrent resolution calling for the referendum to determine whether divorces will be granted on grounds of adultery, physical cruelty, desertion or habitual drunkenness.

CHRISTIAN FRONTIERS

A Journal of Baptist Life and Thought

VOL. II JUNE, 1947 No. 6

EDITORIAL BOARD

DAS KELLEY BARNETT, *Editor-in-Chief*

WILLIAM W. FINLATOR, *Associate Editor*
ALMONTE C. HOWELL, *Advisory Editor*
J. O. BAILEY, *Managing Editor*
WILLIAM M. POTEAT, *Book Editor*
MARJORIE E. MOORE, *Advisory Editor*
SARA LOWREY, *Poetry Editor*

SOUTHWIDE ADVISORY COUNCIL

W. O. CARVER, Louisville, Ky.

H. B. CROSS, Nashville, Tenn.
GEORGE B. CUTTEN, Chapel Hill, N. C.
J. M. DAWSON, Washington, D. C.
CLYDE V. HICKERSON, Richmond, Va.
EDWARD H. PRUDEN, Washington, D. C.
J. C. WILKINSON, Athens, Georgia
SWAN HAYWORTH, Vicksburg, Miss.
WITHROW T. HOLLAND, Haynesville, La.
ADIEL J. MONCRIEF, St. Joseph, Mo.
BLAKE SMITH, Austin, Texas
HUBERT R. HOWARD, JR., Tulsa, Okla.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

LEE C. SHEPPARD, *Chairman*

FRED B. HELMS
CARL LEE OUSLEY
R. K. REDWINE
JOHN MCGINNIS
WARREN CARR
A. C. MCCALL

WILBUR W. HUTCHINS

CONTENTS

Editorials 171
Some Reflections on the Ecumenical Movement ..... W. O. Carver 174
"Thy Kingdom Come" ..... Rev. C. S. Gardner 178
They Made Me a Criminal 182
What Do You Mean—"A Good Hymn"? ..... Thane McDonald 187
Our Southern Baptist Friends ..... Dr. W. Earle Smith 190
Worms and Men ..... C. L. Guthrie 194
Books 195
The Money Changers ..... C. L. Guthrie 198
News 199

Christian Frontiers is published monthly (except July and August) by the Baptist Book Club, a non-profit fellowship of ministers and laymen. Address all correspondence to Box 508, Chapel Hill, North Carolina. *Copyright 1946 by the Baptist Book Club.* *Entered as second class matter February 6, 1947 at the post office at Chapel Hill, N. C. under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription price, two dollars a year; twenty-five cents a copy. Printed by The Graphic Press, Inc., Raleigh, N.C.*

Who's Who In This Issue

W. O. CARVER of Louisville, Kentucky, is Professor Emeritus of Missions at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

C. S. GARDNER, whose article is continued in this issue, was for many years Professor of Homiletics and taught the first courses in Christian Sociology at the Southern Baptist Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky.

THANE McDONALD is a teacher of music in Wake Forest College.

W. EARLE SMITH is Secretary of City Missions for the Northern Baptist Convention at San Francisco.

C. L. GUTHRIE is a Deacon of Saxon Baptist Church, Spartanburg, S. C.

WILLIAM M. POTEAT is the Book Editor of *Christian Frontiers* and the Associate Secretary of the Y.M.C.A. in Chapel Hill, N. C.

EDITORIAL

Conscientious Objectors Again

ON FRIDAY, May 17, 1946, the Southern Baptist Convention, meeting in Miami, Florida, adopted the following recommendation of the Social Service Commission concerning Conscientious Objectors:

"Whereas request comes from National Service Board for Religious Objectors that the Southern Baptist Convention take under consideration the service rendered during the war by other denominations to conscientious objectors who were members of the Southern Baptist churches, and the expense they incurred in that service, and

"Whereas the churches of our Convention have not fully reimbursed the agencies who lent assistance to the members, and the Convention itself has taken no direct action in the matter beyond acting as a receiver of voluntary funds,

"We recommend that the Executive Committee of the Convention be requested to study the facts of the situation and take such action as in its judgment the Convention should rightfully take in the matter."

It is our understanding that when the Executive Committee considered this recommendation, they passed it on to the Public Relations Committee for study.

The Committee on Public Relations brought back the recommendation that $17,708.00 be paid to the Brethren Service Commission as reimbursement for funds expended by them for food and clothing on behalf of approximately fifty Southern Baptist C.O.'s during the war. But this $17,-708.00 was to be paid from the fund raised by Southern Baptists for world relief, with the understanding that it would be used by the Brethren Service Commission for world relief. This recommendation did not pass the Executive Committee, and a vote of "no action" was taken.

In an editorial "Christianity in Spite of the Churches," appearing in the February issue of *Christian Frontiers,* the

following comment concerning the action of the Executive Committee was made:

> "The vote 'no action' on a recommendation to reimburse the Brethren Service Commission $17,708 for food and clothing furnished 45 Baptist conscientious objectors during the war is another question. Though our indignation is far from spent, proportion and propriety enforce a restraint which permits us but to say that it is an honest debt dishonestly disavowed."

As a matter of fact, the Executive Committee cannot be charged with the disavowal of an honest debt, since neither the Executive Committee nor the Southern Baptist Convention had officially promised to reimburse the Brethren Service Commission. *Christian Frontiers* erred in this statement, and we offer our sincere apologies to the Executive Committee for the publication of this charge.

The subject goes far beyond the question of dollars and cents. In fact, the whole problem of the Southern Baptist C.O.'s has been passed around long enough from one committee to another.

Some questions come to mind. Why did the Social Service Commission refer this question to the Executive Committee in the first place? Why did the Executive Committee pass it on to the Public Relations Committee? Was not the Executive Committee empowered by the Convention to make a study of the situation and take action? Another question: Why did the Public Relations Committee recommend an impossible action? Obviously the Executive Committee had no power to divert funds from the offering raised by Southern Baptists for world relief to the Brethren Service Commission. In all charity, it seems to us that from the beginning an atmosphere of evasion has characterized the action of the various committees dealing with this matter.

The editorial policy of *Christian Frontiers* is not pacifistic, but it is Baptistic. From the whipping posts of New England and the jails of Virginia, Baptists have affirmed the primacy of the individual conscience over the demands of the institutional church and the totalitarian state. It was because they belonged to the heritage of freedom nurtured by the

Baptist tradition that some fifty Southern Baptists followed the dictates of their consciences and registered as C.O.'s. Southern Baptists trained them to be free, but the Brethren Service Commission paid the price of their freedom. Shall Baptists, the guardians of religious freedom, disown their own sons?

Again and again we have voted for the principle of the separation of the church and state. At the present time we are actively resisting the subsidy of parochial schools by the public funds of the state. In this struggle it is well to remember that the separation of church and state is a two-edged sword. The church has no right to use the state as a means to its ends. Nor does the state have the right to suppress and intimidate the conscience of the individual Christian.

What better evidence could Southern Baptists give of their sincerity in the struggle for religious freedom than by voluntarily reimbursing the Brethren Service Commission for their expenditure on behalf of the freedom of our sons?

There is no legal obligation to demand this action. The Conscientious Objectors have not requested our support, nor has the Brethren Service Commission presented us with a bill. This, like all great questions, lies beyond the demands of law, in the realm of honor.

Christian Frontiers, therefore, recommends that the names and church affiliation of all Southern Baptist C.O.'s, now being secured by the Executive Committee, be placed in the hands of the Social Service Commission and that the Social Service Commission recommend to the Convention meeting in Memphis that the Brethren Service Commission be reimbursed in full for all expenditures made by them on behalf of bona fide Southern Baptists.

In the event the Social Service Commission does not see fit to reopen this matter, *Christian Frontiers* advocates that Baptists all over the South send funds to the Executive Committee to be used in reimbursing the Brethren Social Service Commission for their contribution.

Some Reflections on the Ecumenical Movement

W. O. Carver

THE FOLLOWING reflections have in mind the significance of the ecumenical movement in current Christendom for Southern Baptists, and the significance of Southern Baptists for the movement.

I. Attitudes

Relatively few Southern Baptists know much that is definite and accurate about the movement. The general attitudes toward it are, first and most prevalent, indifference; second, fear or antagonism; third, curiosity concerning the restlessness, confusion, and earnestness of Protestants in their desire to find ways to overcome weaknesses in the whole evangelical system and to make the influence of the evangelical faith more effective in meeting the needs of a distracted world seeking some secure basis for unity, peace, and ways of living in this age of terror and hope. Finally, there is a small but growing number on whose souls rests heavily the prayer of Our Lord for the complete and perfect unity of all believers in Him and His mission in a world that did not know His Father, and who suffer in spirit over that "divided state of Christendom" which oppressed William Carey as he sought a way for the followers of Christ to obey His world-commission.

Most Southern Baptists have not experienced any painful pressure under the present conditions of the world and of the churches of Christ. Very few of us have seen or even heard of the voluminous quarterly *Christendom,* now in its twelfth year, published by the American Committee for the World Council of Churches. Just now this magazine is especially interesting in view of the plans to set up the World Council, at a meeting of the Assembly in Holland during two weeks in the late summer of 1948. Plans for this meeting are already far advanced. Its main theme has been chosen, "Man's Disorder and God's Design." Four sub-topics have been for-

mulated under which all discussions will be planned: 1, "The Universal Church in God's Design"; 2, "God's Design and Man's Witness"; 3, "The Church and the Disorder of Society"; and 4, "The Church and International Affairs." Details of the programs to be followed are also well advanced.

The Assembly will be set up under the "provisional constitution" adopted at Utrecht in 1938. The Assembly will then be free to amend this constitution and to map its course. A budget of $100,000 is being provided for the expenses of this meeting. All this is adequately set forth by Dr. Van Dusen in the Winter, 1947, number of *Christendom*.

More Southern Baptists know *The Christian Century,* with its urgent insistence on church union. Few issues of that weekly now appear without discussion of this great concern.

Among many other sources of information and discussion concerning the movement for unity and union two are important. *The Congregational Quarterly* (London) for January, 1947, has a most able article by A. N. Knowland raising the question of "Institution or Fellowship." Here is a distinction which seems sadly ignored by most proponents of church union, but one that must be fairly faced before we can get much farther on the road to agreement. The Chicago Theological Seminary, Congregational, a part of the Federated Theological Schools in the University of Chicago, publishes a monthly magazine designed primarily for its alumni, but of general interest. The number for March, 1947, is chiefly devoted to "The Merger," proposed and now far advanced toward decision, of the "Evangelical and Reformed Church" (itself a merger of about two years' standing and still not wholly stabilized) and the Congregational Christian Churches (another merger of longer standing and definitely established). Nearly all the articles are friendly to the merger, some of them strongly urging it, some refuting objections. But the opposition has vigorous statement in two brief papers.

President McGiffert contributes an able and balanced discussion of the larger question of "Protestantism and Organic Union." He brings his readers face to face with the fundamental differences among the distinctive ecclesiologies and ecclesiastical systems. Too many of the enthusiasts for union and pleaders for the "one Church" ignore these differences.

By appeal to powerful sentiment urging the unity of all believers and the practical demand for united effort, these advocates would have all of us ignore our history and our distinctive convictions. Here is the paradox of Protestantism in this matter. It owes its existence to convictions which compelled divergence, and now it is embarrassed by reason of these divergencies and the consequent divisions. Certainly the whole situation—its history, its present confusion, and its challenge for the future—demands a most serious rethinking of the positions of all denominations.

II. Demand for Thorough Thinking

In that rethinking no Christian end is served by pretending that Congregationalism, Presbyterianism, and Episcopacy are matters of indifference. It is blind optimism to think they can all be incorporated into one system. Dr. McGiffert's emphasis on this point is definitely needed at the present stage of the movement for a "United Church."

The "General Council of the Congregational Christian Churches" in 1946 petitioned the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ, and was a little later seconded in its plea by the "International Convention of the Disciples of Christ," to call "a plenary conference of representatives of American Churches to consider the immediate possibility of closer unity" among "those denominations which already accord one another mutual recognition of ministries and sacraments." The Federal Council has complied with this request and has directed such an invitation to each of the major denominations. *The Christian Century,* with characteristic zeal, is pressing hard for the necessity this step places upon every denomination to give answer promptly.

III. Observations

1. One might raise the question whether any group has the right to pose a question and demand that denominations which had no part in producing the situation give an answer.

2. A far more important question is: What of those denominations for which "ministries and sacraments" are not of the essence of the church? In any case, both terms must be

defined before the matter of their "recognition" can be considered.

3. If it is a matter of co-operation in forms of Christian work and world-service, matters of "ministries and sacraments" ought not to be presented as of first consideration. Only if we are thinking of the Church as an institution, of its "faith," "order," and gradation in ecclesiastical standing, could this be of primary importance. If the proposed "plenary conference" is expected to set up the one organic and organized Church, the plan may be given up at once, or postponed until we have gone much farther along the road to unity than we now are.

4. The "World Council of Churches" must adhere to its announced policy of co-operation of "Churches" in common enterprises and witness. Only if it does this can there be any hope of its gaining general approval. The whole matter of definition of "Church" and "church" is here involved, and the evasion of such definition is a fatal weakness in the workers for union.

5. Southern Baptists are in the habit of declining all serious consideration of movements looking to union or to sustained and ordered co-operation. The plausible position is: "Let us attend to our own business, do our own work, and avoid all complicating alliances." Surely Baptists and all other "-ists" should attend strictly and faithfully to their own business. But is that business fully understood and fully accepted? Is it no business of ours that Jesus our Lord prayed agonizingly for the full unity of all His followers? Is it no part of our business to share our insights and convictions with fellow Christians and to receive from them such values as the Holy Spirit has developed in other groups? Is it of no concern to us that we know but little, if at all, of that "love toward all the saints" which Paul accounted of supreme importance? Do we not deceive ourselves if we profess "spiritual unity with all believers" so long as there is no concrete form in which we can give expression to that unity? It is unfaithful to take refuge in vain abstractions from imperative obligations imposed upon us by the Spirit of our Lord. We cannot go the ways proposed, but we should not refuse to seek a way we can go with other friends of Jesus.

"Thy Kingdom Come"

Rev. C. S. Gardner

(This article is continued from the May *Christian Frontiers*.)

AN INSTITUTION or a corporation which is dominated by an evil ideal, or in which is embodied an evil principle, is one of the greatest possible agencies for the spiritual ruin of men. When sin is organized into an institution or corporation, it obtains respectability: it is fortified, bold, defiant. Being built into the social structure it is interrelated with the whole organization of life, and thus not only acquires prestige in the eyes of men, and power over individual hearts, but is inaccessible to moral suasion, and when attacked can rally to its support the whole social system of which the institution in which it is embodied forms a part. To attack it means necessarily to disturb in some measure the equilibrium of the general fabric of society. For this reason, sin that is organized into the social system, when an attempt is made to dislodge it, often calls to its support the conservative instincts of good men. It thus acquires power to create division in the army of Jesus Christ. It gets to be related in some way with the interests of so many men, who by personal inclination would be opposed to it, that it spreads moral paralysis in every direction, lowers ideals, quenches the spirit in the souls of multitudes, spreads worldiness in the churches, and relaxes the springs of evangelistic zeal. If economic corporations and political institutions are to remain under the sway of selfish principles and materialistic ideals, if the Kingdom of God is never to penetrate them, assimilate them, and set ethical and spiritual ideals in their very heart, then no intelligent and honest eye can see anything but lowering clouds on the horizon of the future. If the church of Jesus Christ, when brought face to face with the issue, quails before the task of assailing evil when it is found incorporated in the structure of society and dominant in the economic and political methods in vogue, we may expect the sad wail to grow louder that the church in the great centers of population holds with ever feebler grasp a dwindling group of adherents.

The fundamental trouble is that an anti-Christian principle lies at the basis of many economic and political enterprises. It is sin organized into the most substantial parts of the social fabric, and God is calling us in this day to fight for the eradication of that sin; so that instead of self-seeking materialism and the greed of gain, the law of service shall be made the organic principle of our economic and political life.

The concrete question is this: Can the occupations of the business man and the poltician be converted from means of getting gain into forms of public service? Why should they not? The law of the Kingdom of God is service. Do not business and politics rightfully come under that law? It is not, primarily, a question of consecrating the wealth that is found in a man's hand. Back of that lies a deeper and more vital question. Was the method by which that wealth came into his hands consecrated? Ought it ever to have been in his hands? If the method by which it came into his hand was not righteous, if it came not in fact by the service of his fellow man and his God, rather than the service of self, then no dedication of a fraction of it to charitable purposes can square his account with the world and with God. To speak of converting business enterprises and politics from means of getting gain into forms of unselfish service strikes some ears as the weak twaddle of a dreamer. Such dreams are wrecked at once upon that robust dictum of common sense: "You can't reconstruct human nature." But, I ask, is not Christianity a method of reconstructing human nature? Has it not been proclaimed and accepted for two millenniums that the reconstruction of human nature is exactly what Christianity is in this world for? Now, if in this twentieth century, when we stand facing the task of applying that principle in the real business of life, we are going to run up the white flag and say you cannot change human nature, then, in the name of the God of Veracity, let us be done with this age-long farce! The most unpardonable treason to Jesus Christ of which a man can be guilty is to say that he cannot change human nature and bring it from the service of self into the service of God and one's fellows. He can! He has done it. No man is His follower in whom that change has not been wrought. No man is His disciple who works for his own

profit six days in the week and then pretends to live for God and his fellow men on the seventh. No man has a right to wear His name who dedicates to religion the ill-gotten gain that really belongs to others. No man is a Christian who reserves nine-tenths of his wealth for the pampering of his own body and the bodies of his children, and "gives" the other tenth to God. It is a sacrilegious sham to denominate as Christian a society whose economic and political ideals and methods are in antithesis to the law of the Kingdom. The multiplication of nominal Christians will not avail. If human nature is reconstructed according to the program of our King it must, and will, show itself in the reconstruction of the ideals and methods of our organized social life. The question is not salvation by civilization, but the salvation of civilization.

Yes, to bring this vast, organized life of our times under the sway of the Kingdom, is perhaps, the most stupendous task of our day. There is but one other task comparable to it in magnitude, difficulty and urgency; and that is the evangelization of the non-Christian peoples of the earth. With a strange suddenness it seems to me, the Christian hosts have been brought before two tasks which are great enough to thrill even the most sluggish heart, and great enough to intimidate any but heroic hearts—the propagation of the Gospel of the Kingdom to the limits of the world, and the realization of the social implications of the Kingdom at home. And these two tasks are closely related to each other. For, if Christianity should break down on the social side at home, the evangelistic campaign abroad would be correspondingly weakened. Orientals are engaged in the study of comparative religion on a colossal scale and by a practical method. In response to our missionary enterprise they are sending their ablest men to study our religion on its own ground. And with more open-mindedness than we could have expected, they are investigating its ethical and social effects among the people who ask them to receive it. Now, in the light of such investigation, what appearance does our so-called Christian civilization make? What a humiliating indictment, for instance, do our city slums and city governments constitute? The City is rightly called the center of our civilization. Now, usually, if not always, you find somewhere near the center

of this center, and corresponding to the size of the city, an area consecrated to the heathen gods of vice. So absolutely is that area given over to the worship of Bacchus and Venus that you rarely find a Christian man who dares to challenge their supremacy in the name of Jesus Christ. Respectable homes fly from this district, and the churches follow in the flight. Through its terrible vortex unnumbered thousands are sucked down to the lowest hell. But why is it there? It seems to accompany the city as inevitably as a man's shadow accompanies his body when he walks in the sunshine, and its presence debauches the entire life of the city and gives tone to its government. Manifestly it is a symptom, and a symptom of a constitutional disease. It is a cancerous sore that has for its origin a poison in the blood. We may apply local treatment, and local treatment is far better than no treatment at all, but constitutional treatment alone will reach the cause. The existence of this phenomenon is an advertisement to the whole world either that our Christianity is unequal to the task of social redemption, or that its remedial power has never been thoroughly applied. You and I accept the latter explanation, but the former is more likely to be the explanation given by our objective investigators. That religion alone can make an effective appeal to the whole world which can demonstrate its power to create a new world.

As society develops in the providence of God we see that the old anti-Christian principle of social organization is showing its inadequacy under the fearful strains and stresses of modern life. We see that it is folly to rest the ever-increasing weight of the social structure upon a foundation of materialistic self-seeking, and we are looking about for a better principle. We will discover it when our eyes are open to see the meaning of the Kingdom of God. The inauguration of every new dispensation has been preceded by a period of disintegration due to the collapse of some old, inadequate basis of social adjustment.

It seems to me that we are approaching the close of one and the opening of another great stage in the development of the Kingdom of God. If I have any grave apprehensions, it is that our churches have not a sufficient outlook, a sufficiently broad comprehension of the opportunities that confront them.

They Made Me a Criminal

Dear Reader:

I am a P.O.W.—prisoner of war. No foreign camp is it in which I languish for these five long years. It is a U. S. Federal prison—I am a prisoner of my own land. My loyalty has never been denied by the government, and I am innocent of crime; yet they made me a criminal and put me away in prison. Who am I and why this treatment?

I am your fellow Christian, your fellow church member. I am 15 Southern Baptist young men, 50 Northern Baptist young men, 200 Methodists, hundreds of Disciples, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Catholics, or Jehovah's Witnesses. I am known in my home town as one of the church's finest youth, a leader in its program, and a friend of all men. I am well-educated, and was in some vocation or another which people respect because it serves mankind. Since I speak for more than 6,000 young men of prison experience, I am both single and married, childless and father of children who are cut off from me by prison walls. I am innocent of crime, yet they made me a criminal.

My keepers respect me—but usually they also fear me. Because they fear, they have frequently devised subtle barbarities or descended to rank brutalities designed to break my spirit and make me a cowering, thoughtless automaton. They fear me because they do not understand what is is that put me here, because they know I am not really a criminal, and because here I have sought to apply the spirit and principles of Jesus Christ and have protested the gross violation of those principles: principles of fairness; of equal respect and treatment for all persons and all races; of giving every man the right to health, adequate food, and decent living conditions; of self-respect, cleanliness, and the right to individuality and personality; of a man's right to communicate with his family. Because I have protested the denial of these and other rights to other men, criminals though they be, I have been punished by the loss of these same rights, and by being thrown into "solitary," dragged, and sometimes beaten

and manhandled. Innocent of crime, I rate lower than criminals.

Because I am a Federal prisoner, I will suffer the same loss of civil rights upon my release as the felon suffers. That is, I will not be permitted to vote, to hold public office, or to enter civil service employment or the licensed professions, and a series of related discriminations and social barriers will face me. People will not stop to think that I am not a criminal, that they only put me in a criminal's cell, and that I am innocent.

Prominent Christian leaders, world-renowned scientists, established big-name writers, businessmen, political leaders, government officials, and military heroes have made investigation of the facts for themselves regarding my plight. These public figures have called on our President to make amends to me by releasing me and by restoring my civil rights, as was done in past instances of our nation's history and in our current dealings with conquered nations which we administer. These leaders have written articles in numbers of publications having nationwide circulation, in which they urged the public to give support to their appeal to the President for amnesty (pardon and restoration of all rights).

They have presented the cause of amnesty before public meetings in numbers of cities, and as a consequence of all of these related efforts, the President has been receiving delegations and petitions and resolutions on amnesty, for many months, from every type of organization from labor unions to churches to veterans clubs. The list of these dozens and dozens of groups includes the North Carolina Baptist Convention, the North Carolina Methodist Conference, the Northern Baptist Convention, the Southern Baptist Convention, the Presbyterian, Episcopal, Methodist, and Lutheran national bodies, as well as other denominations, the United Council of Church Women, the Student Christian Association, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the church federations of most major cities, the Workers Defense League, the national C.I.O., the American Federation of Labor, the N.A.A.C.P., the American Civil Liberties Union, the National Farm Labor Union, the American Veterans Committee, the Veterans League of

America, certain posts of the American Legion, and a host of other groups. In spite of this veritable flood of public opinion, supported by the editorials of most newspapers over the country, the President has refused to take any action toward a full amnesty for me—and the 6,000 other men whom they made criminals.

Reports of the Department of Justice, which administers the federal prisons, state clearly that even it feels we should never have been imprisoned.

There is an explanation, of course, for the imprisonment and for the President's lack of interest: "Prejudice." We, who are your fellow Christians, are here in prison for no other reason than prejudice against our effort to live in the spirit of Christ and follow His will for our lives when we felt clearly that His will did not permit us to serve in the miliary forces of the nation. A great number of us were willing to accept the non-military alternative service which the government set up with the cooperation of the historic peace churches (known as Civilian Public Service).* Yet because of the prejudice of local draft boards and regional appeal boards, we were given no chance for such service, which is the legal right of any conscientious objector. Having no choice but the army, we refused that assignment rather than disobey the inner voice of God—and here we are!

Some men did have a choice of CPS or the army, and either from experience of a trial period in CPS or the experience of friends in CPS, became convinced that it, too, was merely one branch of the nation's war machine, serving its special function in the war-time economy of our nation. In our obedience to the inner voice, those of us who felt this way were suddenly faced with the fact that the laws of this country are less liberal than those of England and Canada, for example, and that there is neither true nor full recognition of Christian conscience in these laws. This is the meaning of the Department of Justice's admission that we conscientious objectors should never have been imprisoned.

For our imprisonment, you may personally be responsible on two counts. As a citizen of a democracy, you are respons-

*This alternative was described in the November issue of this magazine in an article entitled, "They Serve Without Weapons."

ible for inadequacy or barbarity of its laws. An American juridical maxim is that "Ignorance of the law is no excuse." Certainly no one who reads this can longer claim ignorance. The second count might be failure to take action to add your voice to others demanding that the President grant full amnesty. There is ample precedent in the actions of a half-dozen former Presidents who served in various periods of our history. *If* you have done what you could throughout the war for liberalization of the conscience clauses of the Selective Service law and for a more humane and unprejudiced local and national administration of the laws—*and if* you have since the war done all you could to present the cause for amnesty both to the President and to Congress in your own name and also through all the organizations of which you are a member, *then* you are cleared of responsibility for the imprisonment and civil rights losses of your fellow Christians.

Many who have supported the cause of amnesty, it is true, are persons who share our convictions of Christian pacifism. Yet the fact is that most of the strength of the drive for amnesty comes from persons who have no trace of pacifism in their own philosophy — veterans' groups, labor unions, government leaders, and others. Their support comes because they know that injustice and false imprisonment of any citizen is wrong, and may prove to be the downfall of all citizens' rights. The church groups supporting our case are adding to their vigilance for justice and for citizens' rights, their real concern for religious liberty and for maintenance of fellowship with their members who are suffering injustice.

It is only one step from imprisonment of religious conscientious objectors, to the imprisonment of all persons whose obedience to the inner voice of God causes them to act upon or express any criticism, however true and needed, of the government. Hitler's first prisoners were those who refused to acknowledge the power of government to conscript sons of God for training in the noble art of killing—his next were all other religious people who made any type of criticism of his government. The German churches learned the lesson the hard way—and too late, proving by their spiritual loss that "Eternal vigilance is the price of [religious] liberty."

The acid test of democracy is the treatment of minority

groups, particularly when in righteous opposition to an ungodly demand made upon them. The United States made a poorer showing than England and the dominions, copying instead the more subtle portions of the totalitarian program of imprisonment for the holding of honest religious convictions which the government has made illegal "for the duration."

The fact that nearly all sentences will have been completely served within a year from now does not justify optimism over the status quo, for the loss of rights to vote, hold office, secure civil service employment or enter licensed professions, etc., is a lifetime punishment, unless presidential amnesty is granted. The appointment of an amnesty review board by the President has meant only a speeding up in the parole of men remaining in prison—parole under special conditions far less liberal than those for criminals. It has indicated no interest in the restoration of civil rights.

Christians who are alert to the threat to religious liberty and who are concerned about the lifetime injustice which has been done in their name to fellow Christians in this land of Christianity and freedom, will still be busy in calling upon the President and upon their Congressmen for a full amnesty involving restoration of all rights and privileges forfeited by conscientious objector prisoners who were sentenced for these violations of the Service act.

History has thrown this question squarely in your lap, Southern Baptist reader—have *you* placed your Christian influence on the side of right and justice in this matter? The time is now.

Sincerely,

Voice of a Southern Baptist Prisoner.

(NOTE: Readers should understand that this letter does not officially represent the 15 Southern Baptist young men sentenced to prison. It is, however, a statement of the facts and general viewpoint, edited by W. M. Hammond, Jr. with the assistance of George Swope and others. It was especially composed for the purpose of relating the facts and insights gained from the letters, conversations, and written records of some 15 or more men who were ministered to through the war years by the independent and unofficial Southern Baptist Fellowship movement.)

What Do You Mean—"A Good Hymn"?

THANE MCDONALD

TODAY in our Protestant churches much intelligent effort is being exerted by ministers and church musicians to raise the standards of church music in general and congregational hymns in particular. To realize the acute need for better music, the minister, the musician, or even the layman needs only to hear some of the radio broadcasts which are prevalent today, many of them originating within our churches. Other programs, usually under commercial sponsorship, broadcast the worst type of street-ballad gospel songs. These programs have no relation to worship, but spread a sanctimonious poison in unworthy and spurious types of song.

Perhaps a re-examination of the elements of a *good* hymn as opposed to the type just mentioned will be helpful.

In considering any hymn, it must be remembered that the technical literary definition, "A song or an ode of praise to Almighty God," necessarily includes the words *and* the music which clothes those words. As no hymn is complete without its musical setting, whether it be a prose chant, a metrical Psalm, or a contemporary English or American hymn, in determining the elements of a good hymn we must consider both the words and the music.

St. Augustine said: "Hymns are praises to God with singing." This definition includes only the hymn of praise and omits many fine hymns concerned with the experiences of penitence, intercession, meditation, instruction, and exhortation. Many of our best-loved hymns are expressions of spiritual experiences in fine literary style, but are not always concerned with praise. Harvey B. Marks in his book *The Rise and Growth of English Hymnody* defines a hymn as "a sacred poem expressive of devotion, spiritual experience or religious truth, fitted to be sung by an assembly of people." With that definition in mind, let us examine some of the essential literary factors of a worthy hymn.

First, the style should be clear and direct and, above all, dignified. Fanciful imagery, extravagant wordings, and crude

diction should be avoided. Countless violations of this principle could be cited; but, on the other hand, the number of truly noble hymns is likewise great, although too many of them lie unused within the covers of our hymnals.

Second, the message of the hymn should be eloquent and inspiring. Many of our finest hymns are paraphrases of passages from the Psalms, such as Martin Luther's stirring "A Mighty Fortress is Our God"; other hymns, such as William Williams' "Guide Me, O Thou Great Jehovah," are based on other portions of the Scriptures. Still others do not rest on a Scriptural basis, but express in beautiful language the personal inspiration of the writer. Such a hymn is Isaac Watts' "When I Survey the Wondrous Cross," one of the finest hymns we possess.

Third, the hymn should be written in a poetic meter which can be easily appreciated by musically untrained congregations. A glance at the metrical index of any hymnal reveals the overwhelming popularity of three meters, S.M. (Short Meter), C.M. (Common Meter), and L.M. (Long Meter). Each of these is a regular four-line stanza in which no verse exceeds eight syllables. These metrical forms are the most practical and easily sung by our congregations.

Fourth, there should be a feeling of absolute sincerity and objectivity in the hymn. Nothing stilted or ambiguous should mar the sincere expression of the hymn, and the general tendency should be towards objectivity rather than intense subjectivity, which all too often results in a supersentimental outpouring of misguided fervor.

Having thus enumerated some desirable practical elements in the words of the hymn, let us turn to the musical settings. Too often it is true that worthy and inspired poetic texts are adapted to cheap and uninspired hymn tunes. To aid in distinguishing the best hymn tunes let us consider several guides.

First, the tune should be subjected to the three types of listening which have been pointed out by Sigmund Spaeth in his book *The Common Sense of Music*. A tune may arouse the "foot listener" by being strongly rhythmic; or it may have a strong melodic interest and appeal to the "heart

listener"; or it may belong to the more highly intellectual class of tunes which interest only the "head listener."

The best tunes will combine these three elements in proper proportion. They will not have an excess of dotted notes with the resultant jumpy, jerky, jazzy rhythms so often found in the cheaper song books sold by music publishers whose chief interest is in financial returns. These flimsy paper-covered books are filled with nondescript doggerel and music altogether unfit to be heard within any house of worship. Furthermore, the best tunes will not display an overuse of "juicy" harmonies liberally sprinkled with superfluous chromatic notes designed to create a sentimental barber-shop atmosphere, rather than to focus the attention of the worshipper on a dignified message.

Second, the tune should contain a reasonable amount of melodic similarity of phrases. A melodic sequence in a hymn tune tends to make it easier to sing, especially by the average layman. Awkward and difficult melodic intervals in the soprano, alto, tenor, or bass voice parts should be avoided.

Third, there should be a steady forward movement in the tune leading to a climax near the end. This climax will usually coincide with a high note in the soprano or melody line. A good example of this is the tune "Lancashire," often sung to the hymn "Lead On, O King Eternal."

Fourth, the tune should be intelligently played by the organist or pianist and sung by the choir and congregation with attention to every word. The finest hymn and the finest tune are meaningless if played and sung in an indifferent manner.

We cannot deal adequately with this subject in a brief article, but the need for careful evaluation of our church hymns is greater today than ever before. Therefore, the minister, church musician, and layman are challenged to help keep the standards of hymn appreciation and understanding as high as possible.

Our Southern Baptist Friends

Dr. W. Earle Smith

TO ONE who takes the long view of a working relationship between the Southern Baptist Convention and the Northern Baptist Convention, particularly in the states of the Southwestern area, the years have revealed a very interesting trend.

We can well recall when the May meetings of Northern Baptists were held at Oklahoma City. There were at that time some Northern Baptist churches in Oklahoma, but after due consideration it was felt by the Northern Baptists that Oklahoma should rightfully belong to the Southern Baptist Convention because of location and the strength of Southern Baptist churches in that state. Therefore, Northern Baptists withdrew from any interest in Oklahoma, as far as attempting to establish Northern Baptist churches was concerned.

Arizona

Some 25 or 30 years ago, while living in Southern California, we recall very vividly the feeling on the part of some of our Baptist brethren in Arizona that, unwisely and unfairly, Southern Baptists were making an organized aggressive approach into that state, which was the area of the Northern Baptist Convention. Wise or otherwise, the Southern Baptist work has been established in Arizona and the Southern Baptist Convention continues to function alongside the Northern Baptist Convention.

Beginnings in California

Some years ago we began to hear reports that our Southern Baptist friends were looking toward our Southern California Convention, and we heard from time to time that there were some Southern Baptist churches being established.

A few years later we heard that some Southern Baptist churches were being founded in the Northern California area. Our reaction at that time was that it seemed most unfortunate that an invasion of organized Southern Baptists into the California area was under way.

A Free Country

We reminded ourselves, however, that America is a free country and that any group of people, Southern Baptists or others, have a perfect right to enter into any portion of America and establish churches and build houses of worship.

On the other hand, we felt at that time it was a serious mistake on the part of our Southern Baptist friends not to throw the entire strength of their leadership behind the California Baptist program and encourage Baptists entering into California from the Southern states, fully to affiliate themselves with the regular program of the Northern Baptist Convention.

Formal Protest

In June, 1944, we wrote a letter to Dr. J. B. Lawrence of the Home Mission Society of the Southern Baptist Convention earnestly protesting the founding of Southern Baptist churches in the California area. We urged the Home Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention to register its disapproval of this movement and join with us in stemming the tide of this development which in our judgment would become a divisive factor in Baptist growth, rather than constructive. Dr. Lawrence informed us that he did not see that there would be any conflict with the work being done by the Northern Baptist Convention and that the Southern Home Mission Society was not in a position to oppose this movement.

The War Period

During the war period many thousands of Southern Baptists moved into California. Many hundreds of them came into the metropolitan area of the San Francisco Bay Cities. Hundreds of these loyal Southern people brought their letters and became affiliated with our Baptist churches throughout the Bay Cities and Northern California, and today many are among our most loyal and capable leaders. In fact, many regular Baptist churches in California have a large percentage of their members who were formerly members of Southern Baptist churches.

On the other hand there came with these people from the

Southland, a number of Baptist preachers, some of whom, we have learned, had unfortunate experiences in the Southland and some of whom were unable to secure churches. During the war many Southern Baptist churches were founded in California and from our observation and information that we have received, the leadership of these churches has been made up in many cases of ministerial brethren coming from the Southland, who during the war worked in war industries and sought to found Southern Baptist churches as part-time service to their war production work. As a result, we have many Southern Baptist churches throughout California. Most of these churches are feeble, meeting in rented store buildings, homes, etc.

One of our great disappointments has been that what seems to us an unwise and rather undercover approach has been made in establishing Southern Baptist work. Never once have we had a Southern Baptist minister who was seeking to establish Southern Baptist work come to our office and seek fellowship and become acquainted with us and our work. It would seem to us that if it is the will of the Lord that Southern Baptists become established in California, there should be a frank, earnest approach to, and desire for, fellowship with the established Northern Baptists of California.

Loyal Southern Trained Ministers

We have in California many ministers who were educated in the South and served in leadership in churches of the Southern Baptist Convention. Many of them are among our most successful ministers in California. The writer counts himself one of the group who came out of the Southern Baptist background. We feel that we can say that this group of ministers is of the opinion that this invasion is an unwise move on the part of Southern Baptists.

Reasons for Entering California

It has been reported to us a number of times that our Southern Baptist friends have stated that their reasons in seeking to establish work in California are two-fold:

One, they feel the Northern Baptists are not preaching the true Gospel.

The other, they feel that California Baptists are not aggressive in establishing Baptist churches.

As far as the first charge is concerned, we feel it is very unfair. Anybody who knows anything about the Baptist position in California, knows full well that Baptist churches are universally evangelistic, aggressively missionary, and thoroughly conservative in theology.

As for the second charge, certainly every Northern Baptist pastor and every church in California most heartily welcomes the loyal cooperation and support of every Baptist that comes from the Southland into the state, but we do feel that our brethren are making a serious mistake when they come seeking to establish a competitive denominational convention.

Interesting Figures

It might be interesting to record here certain facts and figures to discount the charges that we have not been progressive. In the S. F. Bay Cities Baptist Union in the last 12 years we have grown from 30 to 51 Baptist churches, with a number of missions now in organization, that will grow into regular Baptist churches soon. Our Baptist membership 12 years ago in the Bay Cities was 7500 and today is in excess of 23,000. Our annual baptisms 12 years ago were 400 while last year they were 1300. Our total giving to missions 12 years ago was less than $30,000—last year it was about $170,000.

In the area of the Northern California Baptist Convention outside the S. F. Bay Cities Baptist Union, since Reuben Olson came as Executive Secretary of the Convention 2½ years ago, 17 new cooperative Baptist churches have been founded; 11 regular white churches, 4 Negro churches, 3 Spanish churches, and 2 regular white churches have been reinstated into the fellowship of the Convention.

Is It Possible?

At a time when Methodists have definitely moved away from the old Civil War division of North and South, it is a sorry spectacle indeed to see Baptists supported by denominational boards, at this belated time, fanning the old North and South issue. Surely, this is no time to fight again the old issues of the Civil War. If there were the least foundation for the

division from a theological basis, one might find some grounds on which the movement could be supported. Certainly there is no fundamental difference between California Baptists' theology and good Southern Baptists' theology.

A Prayer for Grace

We have never raised our voice in unkind protest or criticism against this Southern Baptist movement. If it is of God then of course we should be the very first to insist that we recognize His will, but our reason does not lead us to believe that it is in line with His will.

We are definitely resolved at all times to refrain from becoming angry with our Southern brethren or in any way permitting ourselves to act in an un-Christian spirit toward them.

However, we definitely feel that the time has come when the good Baptists of California should speak out against this invasion and protest to our Southern brethren that there is no need for the establishment of a Southern Baptist Convention in competition to the Northern Baptist Convention, which God has blessed during the years and which is moving forward throughout California to evangelize and establish churches.

WORMS AND MEN

In a country village lived two men,
But one of the two had a Jim-Crow skin;
So he did the arduous work and chores,
He tilled the soil and cleaned the floors.
The white man seldom turned his hand—
For he it was who owned the land.
Then came the time when Jim Crow died.
They rested him deep by the river's side.
And then the white man did the same;
A marble spire proclaimed his fame.
The twain were scarce beneath the ground
When a million worms their refuge found.
And there beneath the rose and fern
They picked them both from stem to stern.
(Worms are kinder far than men;
They hold as naught one's shade of skin.)

—C. L. GUTHRIE

BOOKS

Justice and the Social Order by Emil Brunner. Harper & Bros., New York. 1945.
The Anatomy of Peace by Emery Reves. Harper & Bros., New York. 1945.
Toward a Democratic New Order by David Bryn-Jones. University of Minnesota Press., Minneapolis, 1945.

Reviewed by
WILLIAM M. POTEAT

There is much to validate the assertion that at the very moment a fundamental concept of a civilization is re-examined and made the subject both of inquiry and apologetics it ceases to have authority—that is, exercise a hold on the allegiance of people—within the matrix of civilizing ideas. This is not necessarily true. It is, perhaps, more accurate to suppose that such inquiry and apology are the response of the creative intellectual minority to the "challenge" of a "time of trouble" —to use the language of Arnold Toynbee.

Whatever final validation history may give to either of these possibilities, it is interesting to view with these in mind the appearance of many books which seek to examine anew the presuppositions of democracy in order to defend them with honesty in the presence of the anti-democratic forces. Whether they will represent the last defense of a political ideal doomed to destruction at the hands of an increasingly dehumanizing civilization, or the creative re-interpretation that can rescue it, remains to be seen. The fact is that political man has come in for more study, of late. One must hasten to add that the urgency of having new and manipulable knowledge about man-the-political-animal is no inconsiderable factor in the popularity of this theme.

The three books under consideration here serve to illustrate the range of interest which the subject evokes. A theologian, a free-lance writer and journalist, and a teacher of political science have this concern in common: The "last, best hope of earth" shall not perish for lack of an advocate.

At the time of its publication *The Anatomy of Peace* received widespread acclaim as a clear, concise and calmly devastating attack upon what Emery Reves has chosen to characterize as the Ptolemaic world view—viewing the world as if our own nation were the center of that world even as Ptolemy viewed the earth as the center of the universe. Opposed to these partial perspectives, Reves points to the Copernican world-view which sees the universe in terms of its true center—the sun. Says he: "In this new and as yet unexplored era we find ourselves completely helpless, equipped with the inadequate, primitive political and social notions inherited from the pre-industrialized world."

The whole substance of Reves' thesis is simply caught in this assertion: "Our political and social conceptions are Ptolemaic. The world in which we live is Copernican."

The Anatomy of Peace seeks to face honestly the inadequacy of all alternatives to world government. The Fallacy of Internationalism reveals the impossible dilemma precipitated by the effort to make international peace among national sovereignties. This is the obvious effort to eat your peace and have your nation, too. Or—to make the situation even more contradictory—it is the effort to have a world government without the *sine qua non* of world government, world sovereignty.

The alternatives of self-determination and of collective security are flayed with equal lucidity and irrefragable logic.

What, then, is the one device by which we can avoid the terrors of the international deep so graphically delineated for us. Law is the answer, saws Mr. Reves. The pre-requisite of government is sovereignty. The foundation of sovereignty is law. The way out is the establishment of world government through the creation of world law.

Mr. Reves' book possesses all the merits of simplicity and should be prized for what it is—and not rejected for what it fails to be. But we must appreciate the difficulties implied in this thesis—lest we be seduced by naiveté. *The Anatomy* is the perfect grammar of politics for the civilized and rational man when he is being civilized and rational. But, in contrast to Brunner's rumbling inquiry into the problem of justice, burdened with the anguished knowledge of man's "holy unreason," his sinfulness, his concupiscence, Reves appears petulant and peevish, and altogether helpless. For, in the last analysis, Reves cannot help but regard the social and political anachronisms of our time, the Ptolemaic world-view in a Copernican world, as errors that pointing to will dispel. They are to him *unnatural* social phenomena. Brunner, on the other hand, is able to regard the same things as unnatural in terms of man's divine destiny, but quite unsurprising in view of his fallen condition.

In a certain sense, the implied presuppositions of Bryn-Jones lie somewhere between Brunner and Reves. Bryn-Jones can be described as a "liberal" political thinker. But in no sense is he to be regarded as among that dwindling group of political philosophers which emerged from the tradition of Bentham and Mill who expressed complete confidence in the reasonableness of a people. He says himself: "It was one of the weaknesses of nineteenth-century liberalism, as typified by John Stuart Mill for example, to overstress the certitude of this return (by the people) to the right course, and conversely to underestimate the power of the irrational forces inherent in human nature." To Brunner, the obstacle to the return to the right course would not be the irrational forces in

human nature, alone; but reason in the service of pride.

Bryn-Jones' book is a competent and comprehensive effort to justify democracy. He deals with The Liberal Tradition, The Basic Concepts of Democracy, Democracy and Industry, Social Democracy, Democracy and Nationality, Democracy and World Order and Democracy and International Relations. One would say of it that it is more a careful documentation of democracy's history and its promise than a creative re-interpretation. He has absorbed the shock induced in recent years by the corruption of freedom in the name of freedom and has been able to face the full danger to liberty which lies concealed in American democratic institutions when the moral foundations of these institutions become obscured.

In applying the presuppositions which he outlines in the first part of his book to the problems of international relations, Bryn-Jones, we feel, has been more realistic in his appreciation of the complexities of the situation than has Reves. He risks no such obviously true, but bland remark that world law is the solution to all our ills—aware that in the chaos which we face the statement does more toward defining the problem than it does toward offering a solution. It is precisely the nature of our dilemma that the basis of world law is nowhere to be found. The need for world law is recognized by its absence and by its impossibility—which leads us directly into the inquiry which engages Brunner's attention.

For it is the recognition of the perversion of every moral ground upon which Justice is erected, upon which law is based that makes Brunner's book more valuable and relevant. This is doubly true since he can face without illusion the depth of this corruption without yielding to despair or forced sentimentality. He is able, as a theologian, to view the problem as one who is caught in the irresolvable tension between the knowledge of man's sinfulness and pretensiousness and the unshakable demands of God's singleness of moral purpose.

It is from the disintegration of the Western idea of Justice that Brunner moves to re-establish in Christian terms the basis for law. The problem is stated in this fashion: "Wrong as a setting aside of order is evil; wrong as a system, as an approved and permanent perversion of a just order, is intolerable." The source of Brunner's superiority throughout is his ability to criticize the problems of natural law and natural ethics from the perspective of revelation. This perspective is the gift of Christianity.

Those who are familiar with Brunner's thought and who find it congenial—or at least suggestive—will want to read *Justice and the Social Order*. It is undoubtedly one of the two or three most important books in Protestant thought written during the war. Certainly it ranks with Brunner's earlier *The Divine Imperative* as a serious and comprehensive contribution to

the body of Reformation thought re-examined.

The study of "the equality and inequality" of people in *Justice* is, perhaps, the most salutary Christian corrective to the sentimentality about equality which, in the name of Justice, seeks to destroy all "differences" among people and groups, thus sterilizing the very germ of dynamic society and, in Christian terms, destroying the very source of human incompleteness and mutual need which is the basis for community. In the familiar Brunnerian term, it perverts the order of creation by which man is able to respond to his creator. It is the loss of this meaning which underlies the disintegration of the Western idea of Justice.

A study of these three books together, all directed toward a common problem, produces an interesting conclusion: The critic who confronts the social and political phenomena of our generation from the point of view of Christian revelation with its revealed knowledge of what the human situation is and of the peculiar problem that man has as a creature living historically can see more clearly than the journalist or the political scientist both the nature of the problem and the bases from which a solution may be projected. This is to say that the quest for meaning in the life of cultures, societies and individual men is in our day, no less than in every age, a theological problem.

—Reprinted by permission from *Prophetic Religion.*

THE MONEY CHANGERS

The tricksters, driven from the temple, soon
Returned, and bought it with their wealth of gold.
They bought it from without and from within,
And captive Christ at Mammon's booth is sold.
Their preacher offers solace, in the end,
To all who are content to be a slave.
The verities of life are taut and thin—
Their preacher offers peace—beyond the grave:
"The poor you have with you—and always must;
The rich are very good and very just.
The meek shall own the earth (when they are dust);
And it's no sin for those of means to lust."
Indeed, the Lord may be in such a den,
But weeping for the erring sons of men.

—C. L. GUTHRIE

NEWS

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA TO ESTABLISH RELIGION DEPARTMENTS

The board of trustees of the University of North Carolina has authorized the establishment of Departments of Religion in each of the university's three branches —the University at Chapel Hill, N. C., State College at Raleigh, and the Woman's College at Greensboro.

Dr. Frank P. Graham, president of the University, said "It's the business of the educated man to become acquainted with religion." He cautioned that carrying the idea of separation of church and state too far can result in "divorcing of the individual and religion."—(RNS)

YOUTH GROUP SPONSORS INTERRACIAL MISSIONS LABORATORY

An interracial and interfaith laboratory on missions and world fellowship, believed to be the first of its kind, was held at Crabtree Creek Park near Durham under the sponsorship of the North Carolina Conference of the Methodist Youth Fellowship.

Delegates at the sessions included: Greeks, Japanese-Americans, Chinese, Indians, Negroes, American Indians, Jews, Catholics, Greek Orthodox and six different Protestant denominations —Baptist, Presbyterian, Congregational, Methodist, Lutheran and Quaker.

On the final day of the conference, which stressed world fellowship and the brotherhood of races and faiths, the 150 delegates attended morning worship services at the chapel on the Duke University campus. —(RNS)

CLERGYMAN, INSTEAD OF DEPUTY, OPENS COURT SESSIONS

Declaring that "personally I believe in prayer and am not ashamed to admit it," Judge Luther Hamilton of Morehead City, N. C., has inaugurated the policy of having a clergyman instead of a court deputy open the terms of Superior Court wherever he presides in the state.

The plan, which has attracted favorable comment, originated, Judge Hamilton says, when he "got to thinking one day of the utter inconsistency of our recitals and our practices. I can think of no place where blessings are needed more than in the courtroom. We need religion on Monday and Tuesday as well as on Sunday. If there is a 'divinity that shapes our ends,' that is, if there is an omniscient and omnipotent Power governing the affairs of life, and from its source can be had inspiration and help for the undertakings of the day, why should not the blessings of such a Power be invoked?

"In other words, why recite the Creeds and rituals on Sunday if we are not willing to give them some practical application on Monday?"

Instead of the invocations which Judge Hamilton has in-

augurated in his courts, customary procedure in opening courts in the state is to have a court deputy repeat a chant which ends, "God save the state and this honorable court." This, says Judge Hamilton, "always seemed to be a desecration."

SOUTHERN BAPTISTS WANT MISSIONARY SHORTWAVE STATION

Washington, D. C. (RNS)—The Southern Baptist Convention is interested in establishing an international shortwave broadcasting station for foreign mission work in various countries around the earth, Dr. Sam Lowe, of Atlanta, Ga., chairman of the Southern Baptist Radio Commission, told a group of government and congressional leaders at a recent dinner on Capitol Hill, it was learned here.

The dinner, arranged by Senator Walter F. George (D.-Ga.), was attended by Senator Tom Connally (D.-Texas), Senator Arthur M. Vandenberg (R.-Mich.), Senator Wallace H. White (R.-Me.), Assistant Secretary of State William Benton, Dr. James M. Dawson, executive director of the Baptist Joint Conference Committee on Public Relations, Charles R. Denny, chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and several subexecutives of the Department of State.

Dr. Lowe told the group that the Southern Baptists are willing to enter into a cooperative arrangement with other Protestant mission bodies to bring the idea of a powerful missionary shortwave station to fruition. The project, he said, would require millions of dollars for financing. He pledged the Southern Baptists to "do their full part" in any such undertaking.

Assistant Secretary of State Benton was quoted by those attending the dinner as having pointed out that all international shortwave broadcasting has been in the hands of the Department of State and that as long as the present situation obtains such a project on an international scale by private groups would be impossible.

However, he is said to have stressed that future policies have not yet been determined by Congress. A proposal now is being discussed, he said, which would place international broadcasting in the hands of a foundation partly financed by the federal government but controlled directly by trustees appointed from all walks of American life.

SOUTHERN BAPTISTS PLAN EXPANSION OF HOSPITAL PROGRAM

Montgomery, Ala. (RNS)—Dr. Frank Tripp has accepted the position of executive director of the hospital commission of the Southern Baptist Convention and administrator of the Southern Baptist Hospital in New Orleans.

Dr. Tripp is president of the Alabama Baptist Convention and pastor of First Baptist church of Montgomery. He is also president of the Montgomery Hospital Association.

CHRISTIAN FRONTIERS

Library
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N. C.

JANUARY, 1948

U. N. C.
CAROLINA RO
FEB 1948

In This Issue:

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION: THE SERVANT OF REVELATION ..... **Dr. Das Kelley Barnett**

THE ALCOHOL PROBLEM ..... **Dr. Clarence Patrick**

CHRIST AND THE SWORD ..... **Rev. Tucker N. Calloway**

Publication of the Baptist Book Club, Incorporated

CHRISTIAN FRONTIERS

A Journal of Baptist Life and Thought

Vol. II JANUARY, 1948 No. 1

EDITORIAL BOARD

WILLIAM W. FINLATOR, *Editor-in-Chief*
MARJORIE E. MOORE, *Advisory Editor*
J. O. BAILEY, *Managing Editor*
ALMONTE C. HOWELL, *Book Editor*
SARA LOWERY, *Poetry Editor*

SOUTHWIDE ADVISORY COUNCIL

W. O. CARVER, LOUISVILLE, KY.
H. B. CROSS, NASHVILLE, TENN.
GEORGE B. CUTTEN, CHAPEL HILL, N. C.
J. M. DAWSON, WASHINGTON, D. C.
CLYDE V. HICKERSON, RICHMOND, VA.
EDWARD H. PRUDEN, WASHINGTON, D. C.
J. C. WILKINSON, ATHENS, GA.
SWAN HAYWORTH, VICKSBURG, MISS.
WITHROW T. HOLLAND, HAYNESVILLE, LA.
ADIEL J. MONCRIEF, ST. JOSEPH, MO.
BLAKE SMITH, AUSTIN, TEXAS
HUBERT R. HOWARD, JR., TULSA, OKLA.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

LEE C. SHEPPARD, *Chairman*
FRED B. HELMS
CARL LEE OUSLEY
R. K. REDWINE
JOHN MCGINNIS
WARREN CARR
A. C. MCCALL
WILBUR W. HUTCHINS

CONTENTS

Editorials 201
Christian Education: The Servant of Revelation....Dr. Das Kelley Barnett.... 204
The Alcohol Problem.....Dr. Clarence Patrick..... 205
Christ and the Sword.....Rev. Tucker N. Calloway 210

Christian Frontiers is published monthly (except July and August) by the Baptist Book Club, a non-profit fellowship of ministers and laymen. Address all correspondence to Box 508, Chapel Hill, North Carolina. *Copyright 1946 by the Baptist Book Club.* *Entered as second class matter February 6, 1947 at the post office at Chapel Hill, N. C. under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription price, two dollars a year; twenty-five cents a copy. Printed by The Graphic Press, Inc., Raleigh, North Carolina.*

EDITORIALS

"HOW LIKE A WINTER . . . ."

After a delay of four months **Christian Frontiers** makes its reappearance with apologies to its subscribers and with gratitude for their patience. The stay in publication is due in part to the loss of its editor, Dr. Das Kelley Barnett, who this fall left the pastorate of the Baptist Church of Chapel Hill to become professor in the Department of Religion at Mercer University. Dr. Barnett's resignation removes from the official family its guiding star and inspiration. His keen analysis of the shifting scenes of our present drama, his swift and forceful application of the Christian ethic, and his organizational abilities will be greatly missed. His loss however will be partly compensated by the assurance of his continued support and the knowledge that he will continue to be a frequent contributor to the journal. For the present W. W. Finlator, who has been associate editor, will serve as editor.

LOSE FACE?

It is considered an error of strategy and bad psychology to fail in any venture "to put up a good front." It is like handing a man a check and asking him to postpone cashing it for several days. It is with no sense of embarrassment, however, that we confess a financial cause in the change of the physical make-up of **Christian Frontiers.** Our journal, in company with other journals of its type, enjoys no financial security. Having no denominational backing and receiving only a token from advertisements, its support must come from the individual men and women who believe in its purpose and place. That the number of such people in our denomination is larger than generally assumed and that this number is growing bring us at once a hope and a challenge. It is the avowed purpose of the directors of **Christian Frontiers** to place the journal on a self-sustaining financial basis completely on the basis of subscriptions. In the meanwhile we shall not put up the front, physically speaking, with which we launched our destiny, and we shall unashamedly accept from our supporters whatever contributions they may send us.

THE RIGHT MAN FOR THE RIGHT JOB

In view of the facts that the South has been termed America's "Economic Problem No. 1," has the largest racial minority, and offers the poorest educational opportunities to her children, and that the predominant religious body in the South is the Southern Baptist Convention, the news that Dr. Hugh A. Brimm has accepted the newly-created office of Secretary of the Southern Baptist Social Service Commission should receive an excited welcome. At its last meeting the Convention instructed its Social Service Commission to establish an office and employ a secretary to care for an enlarged program of relating the Christian ethic as Baptists see it to the social problems of our day. Just what will be the specific nature of Dr. Brimm's work is not yet clear, but if he is guided by the recommendations of the Social Service Commission as found on pages 47 and 48 of the 1947 **SBC Annual,** we may expect in our denomination a keen interest in and heightened awareness of the social problems that in the past we have all too easily ignored.

Dr. Brimm comes to this new field uniquely qualified, having received his doctorate in Christian Sociology at Louisville, served as pastor of the First Baptist Church in Quincy, Florida, and later taught at Mercer University. His work will be largely educational. He must first of all convert us. He must

awaken us to the meaning of labor unions, to the growing tensions between the races, to the feudalism of farm tenancy and share-cropping, and to every social ill that vexes our region. No foolish separation of the personal from the social gospel, no regional conservatism under the banner of religious fundamentalism must hinder his work. So dominant are we Baptists in the South that every Southern problem is a Baptist problem. This is our South, these are our people, and this is our future. More power to you, Dr. Brimm!

ALCOHOLICS ANONYMOUS

In his searching article on the problem of alcohol appearing elsewhere in this issue Dr. Clarence Patrick pays high tribute to the work of Alcoholics Anonymous groups. Many church bodies, including at least one of our State Baptist Conventions, have given AA their official sanction. On the local level this miracle-working group should be encouraged and supported by the ministry and the churches. Orthodoxically speaking, the AA may not be casting out its demons in the name of Christ, but that it is casting out the demons of rum in many an enslaved soul there can be no doubt. We may be very sure that the Master would say of them, "He that is not against me is for me." AA is basically a spiritual organization. To visit one of the meetings is to awaken a wistful longing for the old time prayer meetings. There one finds warmth, fellowship, confidence and "witnessing." Theirs may be a religion on secular wheels, but it is moving and it is doing things. Let us at least be as wise as the Roman Church and bring under our wings if and when we may movements so deeply religious, and so effective.

BAPTIST DISTINCTIVES

Perhaps we cannot hear it said too often that we of the non-Roman communions have infinitely more in common than in variation. A Lutheran may have a background which historically, theologically and culturally is different from that of a Southern Baptist yet both may join hands as Christian brothers on such matters of supreme importance as the inspiration of the Scriptures, the lordship and divinity of Christ, and salvation by grace. Beside such towering doctrines as these which we all share who will say that modes of worship or ecclesiastical machinery or church polity among Protestants are the weightier matters?

Sometimes, however, this solid core of unity which willy-nilly has always been a **fait accompli** of most non-Roman faiths is lost in the insistence of the different sects upon what they regard as their distinctive or unique doctrines and contributions. These distinctives become so easily touted into essentials that one wonders not unkindly if back of it all the basic desire to be different does not play a part. This is said with no intent to disparage natural diversities of interpretation of church government and ritual, but to question whether the importance and honor accorded them are not out of proportion. They belong, we think, in the anise-cummin-and-mint category and should be kept there. However persuaded we are of their truth and importance, they will not do battle where today we must fight "like a mighty army" against the forces of militant secularism, nationalism, and sheer paganism. "For we have to struggle," wrote the apostle Paul, "not with blood and flesh but with the angelic rulers, the angelic authorities, the potentates of the dark present, the spirit forces of evil in the heavenly sphere."

In his sermon, "The Church's Role In America's Future," preached before the Chicago **Sun** Evening Club, Dr. Oscar F. Blackwelder declared: "The measure of a church's right to live lies not in its distinctive doctrines but in what it does with those doctrines, in the question and problems those doctrines are made to tackle. Neither is a church's right to live measured by its uniqueness of worship, but by what

does with peoples and communities hrough that worship. Distinctiveness nd uniqueness may mean sectarian- sm while the church must be concern- d with a total pattern of culture. Thus part of the church's right to existence s its preparedness to do Christ-like attle with non-Christian cultures, as oday with militant atheism, dominant ationalism and pagan secularism. Only a total body of Christian culture an do that. When the church enables nen to out-think, out-love and out- ive the world, it demonstrates its right o existence."

Can we not put the matter this way: ny insistence upon or desire for dis- inctiveness may be shockingly realized when we observe how different is the aith we all declare from that of "mil- tant atheism, dominant nationalism nd pagan secularism"? To call our- selves by the name of him who was n the world and whom the world knew not is to place ourselves in a minority earsomely unique and distinctive. What place have the love of enemies, orgiveness, universal brotherhood, and umility in the scheme of all these sms? Against these "potentates of the dark present" we after twenty cent- uries have a witness which is not simply ignored or disavowed but aggressively challenged by them. Our Master cau- tioned us to remember that while we are in the world we are not of the world. To have the same mind in us which was in him, that rare combina- tion of justice and love and reverence, to own him as the Lord of our lives and the God of our salvation is dis- tinctiveness writ large. That were uniqueness enow. It is our only hope to out-think, out-love and out-live the world.

THE CATHOLIC ISSUE

Among the many frustrations, to use an overworked word, of the Protestant ministry is a laity so ignorant of the political ambitions and successes of the Roman Catholic Church of America that eyebrows are lifted and intolerance hinted when the minister tries to re- move this ignorance. The American hierarchy through the press, movies and radio has done such a bang-up job of selling the Protestant public on the idea that all religious intolerance is on the latter's side that the non- Catholic cannot criticise or oppose any phase of the political activities of the Roman Church without encountering the charge—from his own group—of religious bigotry and Catholic-baiting. The Protestant public has been given a guilt complex over its imagined in- tolerance.

To see the strongholds of religious liberty battered away incessantly, to mark the rise of a power which by its very nature cannot live with democracy, to witness a renascent totalitarianism thriving in a land whose very heritage of tolerance makes possible the usur- pation of its liberties, to see all this and then to tell it to a heedless people, pained and irritated by such bigotry, is frustration indeed. It casts the minister in the modern role of Cassandra. We have seen, but our people will not be- lieve our witness.

In the November 10 issue of **Christianity and Crisis** Dean Robert E. Fitch of the Occidental College in Los An- geles, a naval chaplain in the recent war—and what chaplain has not had his eyes opened?—makes five state- ments about the power polity of the Roman Catholic Church in America. These statements ought to "stab broad awake" some of our Protestant laymen from their namby-pamby tolerance:

1. The Roman Catholic Church is a power polity that "believes itself divine- ly commissioned to hold power and is incredibly uncritical of the corruption that power works in all human beings and institutions that wield it."

2. The Roman Catholic Church is getting this power through its increas- ing influence in politics, journalism, education, over radio and books. (Re- cently a city superintendent of schools, already disturbed at the Catholic at- tacks on public schools as "godless," said he had made the recent discovery for himself that **Life** and **Time** mag-

azines were 100% pro-Catholic. Lord, how long?)

3. "The power of the Catholic Church is a power that is incompatible with liberty. It militates against freedom of inquiry, explicitly repudiates freedom of conscience, denies to the other side even the right to be heard, and deliberately breeds in its people the unquestioning acceptance of authority." If there is a better definition of fascism I have not seen it.

4. Compromise or cooperation with this power except on the most superficial level is impossible. Witness the mixed marriage or the bans against Catholics attending a Protestant service even in the military during a war.

5. "When this power is at its greatest it is at its worst. It is at it worst in countries like Spain, Italy and Argentina where it is strongest. It is mos vigorously attacked not in Protestan countries but in Catholic countries and two of the most progressive Cath olic countries—France and Mexico—ar the most violently anti-clerical. It is a its best in a country—the United State —where it does not yet hold full sway and where it must take root in a cul ture that is predominantly pluralistic Protestant and democratic."

Here is something positively and con vincingly stated. A man can get hi teeth into it. Sell it to the lanquid lay man! We must lay aside every feelin and delicacy and the weight of anti clerical charges that do so heavil beset us and proclaim with boldnes and vigor the menace of Roman Cath olic totalitarianism to religious libert in America.

Christian Education: The Servant of Revelation

by Das Kelley Barnett

All meaningful education is education for living. Christian education is education for Christian living. The founders of Harvard taught their students that "the main end of life is to know God and Jesus Christ which is eternal life." Nazi education served a swastika, Soviet education serves the hammer and sickle, but Christian education serves a cross.

As the steward of the many-sided wisdom of God in Christ Jesus, Christian education would relate that wisdom to the students' quest for the abundant life. This quest for the abundant life is complicated by three problems: the breakdown of personality, the conflicts in human relations, and the peril of atomic annihilation. To these problems, Christian education offers the diagnosis and the solution.

Many an individual in our day leads a life of "quiet desperation." Horney, a practising psychiatrist, writes of **Th Neurotic Personality of Our Time.** Th modern student is harassed by anxi eties, enslaved by fears, tormented b the civil war within, and frustrated i reaching his goals. It is the responsibil ity of Christian education to help hin find freedom from fear, peace within and the satisfaction of solid achieve ment.

In the wisdom of the revelatio Christian education teaches: that free dom from anxiety is found in trustin the Father God; that the civil wa within can be stilled only when th arms of the creatures' rebellion agains the Creator are laid down and man i reconciled to God in Christ; and tha self-realization is only possible throug self-renunciation born of obedience t Jesus the Lord of Life.

Another problem of our time, to which Christian education must be applied, is the growing conflicts in human relations. Training in human relations is a goal of education. How to make friends and influence the boss is a major goal for many. Yet with all our knowledge of psychology, the art of human relations is snarled. Between husband and wife, between management and labor, between class and class, between race and race, conflicts multiply. The milk of human kindness is curdled. There is an epidemic of hate, and the supply of antitoxin is low. It is the teaching of Christian education that the Kingdom of God is the only lasting pattern for human relations, that no conflict can be settled until it is settled right, in terms of justice motivated by love; that the answer to hate is not more hate, but more love—not the love of man, but the love that is shed abroad in our hearts by Jesus Christ.

Modern ways are ways of fear. Man mature in the control of nature is infantile in the control of human nature. I walk across the campus with my daughter, delighted in the rustle of autumn leaves under our feet, and thank God for the joy of the present. But when I think of the future, I look into the sky and hear the roar of planes. Man's fear of nature—of flood, of storm, of epidemic—is almost gone. We do not fear nature; we fear man. The scientist shares our fear and writes: "I am a frightened man, myself." I hear people talking about the possible use of the atomic bomb in war. I tell you there must never be another war. The main race is the race between man's power for evil and his power for good; that race is close to a decision. The answer to our fear is world community. To develop a sense of world community is the task of education. A world community may be formed temporarily by force—remember Rome—or a world community may be formed by the power of a great ideal. Some say that this ideal is the brotherhood of man, but Fatherhood precedes brotherhood; and to talk about brotherhood without Fatherhood is to talk about a world of whimpering orphans, staggering through the valley of death. Here Christian education says that men cannot say "my brother" until they say "our Father"; and that men do not say "our Father" until they say that Jesus, the elder brother, is the Son of God, who at the cross brings God to man and man to God. Here Christian education, in its training of laymen, ministers, and missionaries, becomes the servant of the Word—the instrument of the outreach of World Missions. Education is the instrument of a philosophy of life. Christian education is the servant of a revelation that proclaims that Christ is our Savior and our Wisdom. And the aim of Christian education will ever be to bring men to Christ, to teach them Christ, to train them for Christ.

The Alcohol Problem

by Dr. Clarence Patrick

Alcoholic beverages are among the oldest substances which mankind has used. Their use dates far back into prehistoric times. Yet, strangely, the human race has never been able to reach any conclusion about alcohol. Millions of people have used and defended it, and millions have loathed and condemned it, but few have understood its real nature.

Many people have a notion that the problem of alcohol involves only the use of a chemical substance, ethyl alcohol. They maintain that the solu-

tion to the problem lies in prohibiting the use of alcohol as a beverage. They usually list the harmful effects resulting from its use. To them the problem and the solution are just that simple! We could well wish that such were the case. The alcohol problem has many aspects.

This is a problem on which it is difficult for most of us to work objectively. When our emotions become stirred by observing the disastrous and dangerous effects of the use of alcohol we are prone to adopt some immediate measure without inquiring how the use of alcohol originated, how firmly it is embedded in social custom, what makes it survive, and what effective steps may be taken toward control.

No record is to be found of man's first use of alcoholic beverages. Fermented beverages, wines and beers, have been known to practically all peoples from the dawn of history. The records of all ancient civilizations refer to the use of alcoholic beverages. The earliest of these accounts are found on Egyptian carvings, in the Hebrew script, and on Babylonian tablets. The traditions of many American Indian tribes include references to ancient customs and rites having to do with the indulgence of the aborigines in native intoxicants.

Various alcoholic drinks were universally regarded as wholesome by the early settlers in America. According to John Allen Krout, Puritan clergymen, Dutch merchants, and Virginia planters agreed that the use of alcoholic beverages was not only beneficial, but also necessary. They were quick, however, to rebuke excesses as an abuse of nature's wholesome gifts. There was no hostility to the use of intoxicants even on the part of the moral and religious forces. The church of the colonial days did not recognize any evil of great importance in the use of alcohol. On the other hand, the use of liquors was common at church functions and especially at weddings, church councils, and funerals. The only phase of the question which seemed to arouse opposition wa drunkenness.

In the latter half of the eighteentl century distilled spirits were popula with all classes of people. The popular ity and low price of whiskey, brandy and rum caused intemperance to be come widespread. Almost every town o any size had a stillhouse of its own. B 1792 the annual consumption of liquo equaled two and one-half gallons fo each man, woman, and child. Thi rate, with minor fluctuations, appear to have held until about 1860. Ther from 1860 to 1875 there was a reductio of about one gallon in the per capit consumption of hard liquors. Since 193 there has been an increase in the use of alcoholic beverages among all classes of people.

No one knows exactly how many people in the United States use alcoholic beverages. Dr. E. M. Jellinek of Yale University estimates that fifty million use alcoholic beverages.

A more underlying problem is, why does mankind use alcoholic beverages?

The "reasons" for drinking, i.e., what the drinker expects to receive from alcohol, may be stated in four classes:

1. Alcoholic beverages may be used as condiments or thirst-quenching drinks or simply to add color in connection with meals and at social gatherings. It is generally foreign to Americans to use wine and beer with meals, but this usage is a national custom in France, Germany, and Italy.

2. Alcoholic beverages may be used because of the feeling of exaltation which they induce. In such a case the desire may be to heighten fun and enthusiasm, release inhibitions, socialize, or celebrate.

3. Alcoholic beverages may be used because of the narcotic, or depressant effect which they produce. Here the desire may be for an escape from something, to banish anxieties and frustrations, to relieve tensions, or to get relief from physical pain.

4. Alcoholic beverages may be used because people desire to conform to social custom. The social pressure in a

group or society where the custom of drinking is widespread often makes it difficult for an individual to abstain.

If the history of liquor legislation in this country has anything to teach us it is that often we have imposed on law a task which law by itself is not able to accomplish. Law has been resorted to in an attempt to overcome the failures of other agencies of social control. We have frequently fallen into the fallacy of believing that we could change by law tendencies which in their nature are not easily modified by coercion. It is as James Coolidge Carter says: "Nothing is more attractive to the benevolent vanity of men than the notion that they can effect great improvement in society by the simple process of forbidding all wrong conduct, or conduct that they think is wrong, by law, and of enjoining all good conduct by the same means."

Public standards furnish the basis for law. Ordinarily the only standard which law has any possibility of enforcing is the standard prevailing in the general population and not that which obtains in a single group, no matter how socially-minded or enlightened it may be. Public standards are not created by means of nightsticks, but rather through the long, slow, and difficult process of education. Thus it is through the processes of education and conditioning that the fundamental approach to the problem of alcohol is to be found.

Government and law have an important part to play if they are based on the attitudes and desires of the public. When government and law are backed by strong public support they are the chief means of maintaining unity and order and of controlling the aberrant individuals and groups whose behavior is against social welfare.

Three basic principles for a control system are:

1. The Federal Government should prohibit the advertising of all alcoholic beverages. This would include advertising by newspapers, magazines, radio, billboards, booklets, leaflets, and other means.

2. The Federal Government should require a warning label to be placed on every bottle of beverage alcohol stating the nature of such a beverage and the danger involved in its use.

3. The public revenue-raising motive should be divorced, as far as possible, from the liquor traffic. To treat liquor control mainly as a revenue matter is in danger of causing the government to further production and sale of alcoholic beverages as a profitable business. Therefore, all money received by the Federal and State Governments from taxes and profits on alcoholic beverages should be placed in a separate fund. After all expenses involved in the control system have been deducted, the money should be used to help in removing the need which causes alcoholic beverages to be given prominent place in our culture. To this end, the funds should be spent on educational, social, medical, and legislative measures. The establishment of adequate hospitals or farms for the care and treatment of alcohol addicts should be one phase of such a program.

In working toward a solution of the alcohol problem, ultimate reliance must be placed upon methods that will enable society to modify or remove from its cultural system the custom of using alcoholic beverages. In other words, the alcohol problem, like any other social problem, must be treated at sources that reach back into the desires, needs, attitudes, and habits of the members of society. Among the methods by which the social custom of using alcoholic beverages may be changed, the following deserve primary consideration: (1) the establishment of acceptable substitutes for alcoholic beverages, (2) a widespread understanding on the part of the members of society of the nature and effects of the use of alcoholic beverages, and (3) the development of a social consciousness concerning the problems arising out of their use.

There must be a recognition of the

fact that alcoholic beverages are used because people feel that they satisfy certain needs and desires. Alcohol does give temporary relief from worry, removes mental tension, disguises difficulties, obliterates feelings of inferiority, and offers other momentary satisfactions. It is not likely that the conditions in any civilized society will ever be so ideal that its members will be free from needs and desires. Neither does it appear probable that mankind will not always want something that lends "ceremony, color, and fellowship to life." If the leaders of a society find that the use of alcoholic beverages works against personal and social welfare and efficiency and therefore attempt to remove the use of such drinks from that society, then they should seek to establish acceptable substitutes for beverage alcohol. In other words, abstinence must be made more than a negation.

What are some of the substitutes for alcohol?

1. More wholesome and enjoyable means of recreation and entertainment would be among the alternatives to alcohol. It is common knowledge that athletes in training ordinarily consume no liquor. Football and baseball players, track men, and contenders for championships in various games are, with almost no exception, total abstainers, at least while they are engaged in the various sports. They have evidently found something which they choose in preference to alcoholic beverages. It is fairly common knowledge that the average American community is sorely lacking in suitable means of recreation for both its young people and adults. More intelligent and ingenious planning of social gatherings would serve perhaps as well as alcohol to give color, life, and fellowship.

2. The practice of sound principles of mental hygiene would help. Millions of people have learned how to relax or to forget temporarily their worries without resorting to the use of alcoholic beverages or other narcotics.

3. Vital religious experience is important. Within the past hundred year religious people, particularly evangel ical Protestants, have revolutionize their thoughts and attitudes regardin the use of alcoholic beverages. Earl American religious bodies not only ap proved but also defended the use o alcoholic beverages. Today the value and standards of most Christian group are definitely opposed to the use o alcohol as a beverage. Also, many suc groups advocate the belief in a "wa of life" that will enable a person to ge along without alcohol. There are case in almost every American communit of alcohol addicts who through religio were able to free themselves from th hold which alcohol had upon them.

Perhaps the best illustration of th power of religion to free men from al cohol addiction is seen in the result of Alcoholics Anonymous, an organiza tion of ex-alcoholics (they speak o themselves as arrested cases), whic now maintains chapters in many Amer ican cities. Ministers, physicians, an social workers are increasingly testify ing that this organization's methods ar sound and their results promising. Al coholics Anonymous claim that they bring about their "cures" through "mu tual aid" and "a spiritual common de nominator." They say:

> It has been demonstrated that at least two out of three alcoholics who wish to get well could apparently do so.
>
> With few exceptions our members find that they have tapped an unsuspected inner resource which they presently identify with their own conception of a Power greater than themselves.
>
> Most of us think this awareness of a Power greater than ourselves the essence of spiritual experience.

The results of scientific investigation on the nature and effects of the use of alcohol should not be allowed to remain in the library or laboratory. In his address as president of the American Public Health Association in 1936, Dr. Haven Emerson said: "Lack of information is largely responsible for the

use of alcoholic beverages as if they were necessary or in any way useful to a healthy man or woman."

It is largely through education that the habits, opinions, and standards of the members of a society are changed. Of course, it must be acknowledged that education is a much-abused term. All too often in popular thinking education is looked upon as a final solution rather than as a working method. The school by itself it able to do little in modifying or stabilizing the ideals, habits, and standards of the individual. Other agencies, equally or more influential than the school, must be linked up in the process.

Furthermore, certain principles must be followed in any educational approach, if it is to be effective, on the subject of the use of alcoholic beverages:

1. The discussions of the nature and effects of alcohol should be based only upon established facts. The scientifically accepted findings regarding the dangers involved in the use of alcohol are so disturbing that they do not need embellishing. Instruction on alcohol that exaggerates and misleads ultimately tends to defeat its own purpose.

2. The approach to the question of alcohol should be in the spirit of free discussion and based on a desire for an unprejudiced dissemination of facts. The leaders in an educational program should be of tolerant spirit, and possess a broad and scientific understanding of the problems of alcohol.

3. The main emphasis of instruction on alcohol should be based upon life, health, personal and social efficiency and welfare rather than upon the horrors of disease and death. The average person cannot be frightened into good behavior or browbeaten into accepting a particular pattern of living. Too much of the temperance teaching of the past has followed such methods and thus has been, as someone has said, a "pedagogical monstrosity."

What are the agencies that should assume the responsibility in educating the members of society on the nature and effects of the use of alcoholic beverages? First and foremost, it seems, comes the family. Our ideals, standards, and values have not only grown up, to a large extent, in the family and the other intimate, or face-to-face groups, but they are also, to a very large degree, transmitted from individual to individual through such groups. The child can probably get the meaning of the use of alcoholic beverages better through the family group than he can through any other agency. What a child learns by precept and example from members of the family is likely more influential than what he learns from any other source.

A second agency that has an important part to play in alcohol education is the school. However, at this point, certain difficulties are encountered. What shall a school teach about alcohol? What shall be the aim of its instruction? Today all but one of the states have laws requiring public school temperance instruction. In many of the states the schools face the problem of determining what is meant by "temperance instruction." Does it mean total abstinence or moderation in the use of alcoholic beverages? The dry forces in using the term temperance usually mean total abstinence, while the anti-drys in using the term mean moderation. Perhaps such uncertainty and lack of definition are among the main causes for the perfunctory and inadequate program of alcohol education in many states.

It now seems evident that the only educational program on beverage alcohol that will enlist the interest and respect of students and teachers is one that faces the problem as a whole and one that, in an unbiased manner, considers all the available knowledge on the subject. It will also be a program that relates the facts of alcohol to every-day living.

A third agency that may have wide influence in alcohol education is the church. Church leaders and church organizations have played a vital role in the temperance education of the

past hundred years. In its function as an educational institution it has an important part to play in developing a realistic understanding of the nature and effects of the use of alcoholic beverages. The teaching and training program of religious groups may be highly effective if based on established facts, made interesting, and adapted to everyday living. A religious group of young people in one American city conducted a clinic, "Youth Looks at Alcohol." Some of the subjects for discussion were as follows: "What Liquor Costs the People of Our Country," "Radio Advertising of Beer," "The Liquor Ads," and "What We Saw at the Honky-tonks." Such activities, directed by able leaders well informed on the alcohol problem, should be of significant educational value.

Also, the church has the opportunity of setting high moral standards before its members and the community. Many churches have a covenant by which the members agree "to abstain from the sale and use of intoxicating drinks as a beverage."

A fourth influence of wide character in alcohol education may be adult education groups. If alcohol education is to be truly effective, it must go beyond the limits of the home, the school, and the church. It is possible that adult education groups could focus attention on the problems of alcohol and bring together men and woman interested in learning the facts about alcohol and in maintaining a sober society. It seems that such groups could be greatly assisted by the State Boards of Education, various public institutions, medical societies, the church, and other civic agencies.

The majority of the American people have looked upon the use of alcoholic beverages as being an individual matter. However, it is evident that the use of intoxicating beverages in a modern society is far more than an individual problem. Ours is a highly interdependent society. The behavior of each member of a group has a definite relationship to the welfare of the group as a whole.

If the members of a society possess strong convictions as to what is right and what is wrong, what is useful and what is detrimental, and what works for and what works against personal and social efficiency, then it seems that something can and will be done about the great social problems. They will make a strong and intelligent attempt to control the use of alcoholic beverages when they recognize that their use is affecting adversely life, health, and personal and social welfare.

Christ and the Sword

by Tucker N. Calloway

During the recent war many Christian young men were called upon to face the question: can I, as a follower of Jesus Christ, conscientiously take up arms against my fellow man? It was a difficult question. Obviously, war was wrong; no Christian **wanted** to kill; but would it not be worse still to permit ruthless pagan elements to overrun the world?

While a student at the Baptist Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky, I, too, was called upon to face the question. Always, my attitude toward Christian participation in war had been that killing was bad, but domination by the Nazis was worse. At this time, wishing to be sure of my position, I turned to the New Testament to find what Jesus taught on this matter of physical warfare as a means of defending righteousness.

This Bible study forced me to a very disconcerting conclusion. I found my-

self swept against my will into the conviction that Jesus' teaching leaves no room for war as a means to peace. As a result, I became a conscientious objector to military service. Subsequent study, prayer, and experience have confirmed this stand.

Let us look at some of the teachings of Jesus that appears to favor this conclusion. After that, we will examine some of the passages in which men claim to have found justification for Christians to wage war.

1. Matthew 5:21f: You have heard that it was said to the men of old, "You shall not kill . . ." But I say to you, that every one who is angry with his brother shall be liable to judgment . . .

Here Jesus plainly reaffirms the Old Testament commandment, "Thou shalt not kill." And then goes farther to state that anger against another is in the same category with killing. I can find nothing conditional in these verses. In the last war, one of the items in the basic training of most soldiers was to get them angry with the Nazis and the "Japs." If you attended bayonet practice, perhaps you heard the instructor urging his men to more enthusiasm as they charged their dummies: "Come on, get mad at 'em!" Jesus said that we shall neither kill, nor be angry.

2. Along these same lines comes the familiar, Matthew 5:43-46: You have heard that . . . "You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy." But I say to you, love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be true sons of your Father who is in heaven . . .

There is nothing new in loving the folks at home and hating those who come against them to do them harm. You have all heard that, said Jesus. But, he continues, it is wrong. Then, he presents his alternative to hate. Jesus tells us here what he would have us do to those who offer us violence: love them, pray for them. The intention of love is to benefit its object. Can you kill a man you love, knowing that when you take his life you send him into eternity, lost from God? What can you pray for him whom you are about to destroy? Though I have tried, I have not been able to discover how I could kill a man through love for him.

3. But let us move to a third passage, Matthew 5:38-41: You have heard that it was said, "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." But **I** say to you, **Do not resist one who is evil.** But if any one strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also; and if any one would sue you and take away your coat, let him have your cloak as well; and if one forces you to go one mile, go with him two miles.

Some say that Jesus did not mean for people to do these things he taught. Such things are too much for frail human beings. I wonder, if Jesus did not mean for us to live these teachings, why he closed his Sermon on the Mount with the statement that "Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock." When Jesus commanded his disciples not to resist one who is evil, I believe he meant us to live that way. To leave no room for doubt concerning his meaning he followed this statement about renouncing resistance with illustrations of its application in three areas of life. He says, Do not resist one who is evil when he attacks (1) your body (strikes your right cheek); (2) your property (takes your coat); (3) your freedom (forces you to go one mile). He says, rather than resist the aggressor, co-operate with him. Go the second mile. In this, he has stated for all times the **one** means a man has of overcoming the evil disposition of another toward himself. We did not overcome the enmity which the Nazis have toward us by conquering them in battle; but Jesus overcame the world when he let itnail him to the cross.

4. Finally, may we give attention to two other passages in which it appears

to me Jesus rules the Christian from battle. They both come from the hours immediately preceding his crucifixion.

In Matthew 26:47-56 we find Jesus putting into practice those things he taught in the Sermon on the Mount. A great crowd had come against him armed with swords and clubs; his disciples were ready to defend him to the death. In an instant Peter's sword sang from its sheath, flashed a lightning reflection of torch blaze, and descended! Before anyone could hinder, he had tried to split a man's head. Jesus wheeled on Peter to issue him a sharp command. "Put your sword back into its place!" As a reason for this rebuke, he added, "for all who take the sword will perish by the sword." I understand this to mean that Jesus thought the use of arms is vain, and that violence begets violence. "All who take the sword will perish by the sword."

Early the next morning, Jesus had occasion further to clarify this view. In John 18:33-36 he had allowed himself to be taken by the mob. Now he stands before Pilate accused by the Jews of attempting to lead a revolt against the Roman Empire to be crowned king of the Jewish nation. Jesus denies the charge by saying, "My kingdom is not of **this** world." He had no desire for political power. To prove it, he continues, "If my kingdom **were** of this world, **then** would my servants have fought that I might not have been handed over to the Jews."

The sword is a logical tool in the hand of man whose desire is set upon the kingdoms of this world; but for those who seek the kingdom of the spirit a sword is superfluous. Ponder this question deeply: which of the things for which Jesus teaches us to live is either destructible, or defendable, by military might? I have yet to see a cannon that can kill kindness, a tank that can trammel truth, or a firing squad that can frighten unfeigned faith. The values for which Christ lived and died are not in jeopardy before any weapon this world may produce. Sure of this, Christ could thrill us with his song of victory, "Be of good cheer. I have overcome the world!"

In the above you see the chief scriptures that brought me to the position of conscientious objector to Christian military participation. Since arriving at this inconvenient conclusion I have seized upon every scriptural objection to it that has been suggested. But as I have studied these passages which are supposed to indicate that Christ did not oppose military service for Christians, one by one, they have gone to pieces in my hands.

Some of the reasons given for believing Christ sanctioned war are as follows:

1. It is pointed out that there were religious wars in the Old Testament, and that Christ supported the Old Testament. This is true. But Christ also said he had come to clarify and supplement the Old Testament. As he said, "If you have seen **me,** you have seen the Father." Consequently, if Jesus teaches there is a still higher way than righteous war to overcome the enemies of God, I choose to follow him, rather than a lesser guide, even if it be the Old Testament. He is the final authority.

2. When Jesus found the money makers in the temple he made a whip and drove them forth, overturning the tables. Unquestionably, here we find Jesus using force to attain his end. But this is an entirely different situation from that of war. Assuredly, it shows that Jesus would approve spanking a child when he misbehaves, for his own good. What Jesus did in the temple that day, he did as much from love of the offenders as from love of his Father's house. Jesus did not **kill** the money changers or the sellers of oxen. The motive for his violence was love of them, and his purpose was their correction.

When a G.I. shot a Nazi, there was no prospect of correction so far as that Nazi was concerned. I can discover nothing in Jesus' cleansing of the temple that gives sanction to war.

3. Then, there are his famous words,

"Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." In Matthew 22:15-22 some trouble makers were attempting to get Jesus to make a treasonable statement against the Roman Emperor. Testing him, they asked, "Is it lawful to pay taxes to Caesar, or not?" But Jesus would not fall into their trap. "Show me the money for the tax." Holding up the coin they gave him, he asked, "Whose picture is this stamped on the coin?" They answered, "Caesar's." He said to them, "Render, therefore, to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's."

From this statement many have deduced that we owe the Caesars of the world unhesitating obedience in times of war. When the leaders of the state sound the call to battle, they say, it is the wish of Christ that we comply. But Jesus also said something about giving God the things that are his. True enough, the tax coin was Caesar's. It was stamped with his image. Nobody doubts that taxes belong to the kingdoms of the world.

But, what are the things that are God's? What belongs to him? What is it that is stamped with **his** image? The Bible tells us it is **Man!** "In the image of God created he him." The governments of the world are in their place when they seek to regulate the taxes. But who says an earthly government has the heaven-born right to command God's creatures to destroy God's creatures? When a Christian receives orders from God that conflict with the orders of his nation, which should be obey? A real disciple of Jesus will not need to grope for an answer. God's will is above all!

4. Many say Jesus showed he was not opposed to military participation because in his dealings with the Centurion who came to him (Matthew 8:5-13; Luke 7:1-10) there is no record of his demanding this Roman soldier to leave his profession. In this connection, you will recall that Paul also did not require Philemon to release his slave Onesimus before becoming a Christian. Just as it is possible for a man to be at the same time a **slave-holder** and a Christian, he may also be a **soldier** and a Christian. We are not saved by works but by faith in a loving God. We begin the Christian life as little children in understanding. At the outset we are to be fed on milk. Only as we begin to reach maturity will Christ give us meat. Anyone who knows the ways of dealing with a new Christian will quickly see that even if Jesus did hold non-participation in war as a higher ideal than military service, he would hardly have expected the Centurion to be ready for such a revolutionary idea in the first days of his Christian life.

5. Last of all we will speak of the two times in which Jesus appears to speak in favor of the sword as an instrument in his service.

The first is Luke 22:36, 38. Jesus knew it was his last night with his disciples. With all his heart he wanted to prepare them for the difficulties which he realized lay ahead for them. Among other things, he said to them, "And let him who has no sword sell his mantle and buy one." One of the disciples answered with concern, "Look, Lord, here are two swords." And he said to them, "It is enough." Some have interpreted these words of Jesus to mean that he was commanding his disciples to carry weapons for their protection.

They forget what happened when Peter, a few hours later, tried to use a sword. We have already noticed how Jesus rebuked him and had him to put away his sword. The question naturally arises, then, what did the Master mean when he urged, "And let him who has no sword sell his mantle and buy one?"

Dr. A. T. Robertson writes of this passage (**Word Pictures**, Vol. 2, P. 271), "The reference is to the special mission (of the disciples) in Galilee. They are to expect persecution and bitter hostility. **Jesus does not mean that his disciples are to repel force by force,** but they are to be ready to defend his cause against attack . . . This language can be misunderstood (today) as it was

then . . . They took his words literally." Jesus was not instructing his disciples to defend the cause with a sword. That was Mohammed's view. The Lord had simply spoken of the sword in a symbolic sense. He was preparing the disciples for warfare against temptations, rejection, and persecution: spiritual warfare, not physical. When they misunderstood him and held up the two real swords, with a weary smile of disappointment at their blindness, he said with gentle sarcasm, O yes, two swords will be enough. Christ neither here nor elsewhere proposes that Christians arm themselves for physical combat with hostile forces.

The other, and more familiar of Jesus' remarks about swords misunderstood to mean that he did not oppose Christians going to war is Matthew 10:34. "Do not think I have come to bring peace on earth," he said, "I have not come to bring peace, but a sword." In this, it is insisted, we have the Master asserting that he not only permits military occupations for his followers, but that he had come into the world to start wars. Those who hold this literal interpretation of Jesus' words have not seriously examined the context. For Jesus goes on to illustrate his meaning. Matthew 10:35f: "For I have come to set a man against his father, and a daughter against her mother . . . and a man's foes will be those of his own household." Can anyone who knows the Lord believe that he expected his disciples to use a sword of cold steel against the members of their own household? I think not. "I have not come to bring peace, but a sword . . . and a man's foes will be those of his own household." His meaning is not obscure. In this, the Master is simply describing the consequences when a member of a non-Christian family becomes a Christian. For example, as sometimes happens here in Hawaii, when a daughter of a Buddhist home goes over to the Christian religion she finds her own father and mother antagonistic. She may even be forced to leave the home. When the Lord speaks of himself as bringing, instead of peace, a sword, he is not condoning physical warfare. He is describing in vivid poetic language the inevitability of family troubles when some members are Christians and others oppose.

All that has been said can be summed up very briefly. Through Bible study, I have been brought to the conviction that Christ prefers his followers not to participate in war. We find him speaking against hate, killing, and violence, but favoring love of enemies and aggressive good will. On the other hand, we cannot find any place where he gives his slightest consent to the idea that under certain conditions a Christian might be expected to take up arms against his fellow men.

Since these things are true, since Christ did teach that when we are faced by the aggression of Godless enemies there is a higher way to combat it than by taking up the sword, what is this way? What should be a disciple's response? Should he say, "Jesus may have taught it, but I think it is foolishness, so I will not obey?" If so, then many of us have a mistaken conception of the meaning of discipleship. If Christ is Master and Lord, it seems to follow that we are his obedient slaves. We sing, "Wherever he leads I'll go." Do we mean to add the qualification, "Wherever he leads I'll go on the condition that I think where he leads is the most sensible direction"? I think this: Since Jesus is God's only begotten son; since, as he said, his life is a perfect reflection of God's will to us; then we can be sure that wherever he leads is **best**, regardless of what mere human minds may think of it.

From studying the life and words of Jesus I have come to believe that he taught the ways of love, exclusive of the ways of battle. Therefore, God being my helper, I will not deliberately kill, or in any way assist others to kill, any man. Instead, I take the words of Paul, "Be not overcome of evil; but overcome evil with good."

Book Review

Preface to Critical Reading by Richard D. Altick. New York: Henry Holt and Co. 321 pp. $1.60.

Of course you know how to read, else you wouldn't be reading this review. But do you **really know** what you read? Does your reading dig "beneath the surface attempting to find out not only the whole truth about what is being said, but also (and this is, in the long run, more important) the hidden implications and motives of the writer?" Professor Altick's fascinating little book will enable you to bring a new critical awareness to your reading, to guard more carefully your own utterances from the dangers of circumlocution, euphemism, glittering generalities, cliches, "newspaperese," and some of the other ills that have made reading so cheap and writing so profitable.

Every speaker or writer who values his freedom of mind, who wishes to play fair with his audiences will find in Professor Altick's provocative treatment of the art of reading a challenge. Here is no pedantic presentation of stale rules; here is a fresh approach to the problem of saying things simply—expressed through the medium of an expose of the shallow, hypocritical, insincere, and often deliberately meretricious writing that fills our journals, blares from our radios, and yes, echoes from our pulpits.

Let me digest briefly one bit from the chapter "connotation and denotation," the discussion on glittering generalities. A writer calls Mr. X, a high government official, a communist. Actually he has liberal tendencies and probably reads the **New Republic.** But the listener immediately thinks "I don't like communists. They are a godless people, practice free love, have a low standard of living, speak a barbarous tongue, don't have freedom of the press, have the world's most ruthless secret police, send people to Siberia, and are trying to overthrow all the governments of the world. All these things are terrible; therefore communists are dangerous and diabolical. You say this man is a communist? All right then, THROW HIM OUT OF OFFICE!"

"**In other words:** A (Mr. X) is B (a communist) [there is no proof that he is]; I don't like B [on no good grounds, because I am confused and misinformed on a number of important points]; therefore I don't like A.

"To find all the lapses of logic in that simple statement would be the occupation of an hour—but never would an hour be more instructively spent. Yet the world rings with condemnations which are just as irrational, and people believe them because it is far easier to paste a label on a bottle than to analyze its contents."

Similarly, when the candidate for office affirms "We must protect our sacred heritage, the American way of life," two listeners, thinking of what **they** mean by this phrase, get entirely opposite impressions. To the laborer it means high wages, monopolies forbidden, labor unions protected, equal opportunity, etc. To the factory owner it means no government interference in free enterprise, control of labor unions by restrictive laws, the right to make all the money he can, etc.

"Who is going to be disappointed after the candidate takes office and begins making decisions? He cannot serve two masters; yet both voted for him because he favored what they favored—a vague phrase which was bound to please them, so long as **it remained undefined."**

Even more stimulating are the chapters on logic and on reading newspapers. Certainly the book is a lively presentation of the new doctrines with which present-day teachers are attempting to combat the deleterious forces which through press, radio, and advertising are constantly weakening

the powers of discrimination and cultivating morons who may well become the dupes of some future Hitler. Against these forces, to which we all are subjected, Professor Altick's book, like Stuart Chase's **The Tyranny of Words,** Mortimer Adler's **How to Read a Book,** and Rudolph Flesch's **The Art of Plain Talk,** are welcome counter-attacks.

—A. C. Howell
University of North Carolina

Dachau Sermons by Martin Niemoller. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1946. 97 pp. $1.50.

"Would God I, too, might spend eight years in a concentration camp," exclaims the minister as he finishes reading **Dachau Sermons,** "if it could help me to preach sermons like that!" For seldom has this reviewer come across sermons as pertinent to the needs of the congregation as these six, preached to nine prisoners at Dachau, from Christmas Eve, 1944, to Easter Monday, 1945.

The sermons here included are those delivered on church holidays over a period of slightly more than three months and are based on the proscribed gospel for a given day, as found in the Lutheran book of worship. That Niemoller is able to take a text which has been predetermined for use in a particular service and give to his messages such relevancy, is testimony to the fact that here is really great preaching. Says Pastor Niemoller, "It is the peculiarity of the word of God that it demands to be heard by us in any situation and at any time, because in any situation and at any time it has the message we need."

These six sermons are life-situation preaching at its best.

—Charles B. McConnell
Pastor, Franklinton
Baptist Church

The Spirit of Chinese Culture by Francis C. M. Wei. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1947. 186 pp. $2.75.

Wei's **The Spirit of Chinese Culture,** containing the Hewett Lectures for 1946, comes from the well known president of Hua Chung University, Wuchang, China. It is a study of the moral tradition and religion of the Chinese people by a scholar who is both a Christian and a Chinese. It begins with a discussion of the relationship between Christianity and Chinese Culture and ends with some remarkable suggestions for making Christianity indigenous in China. As a basis for these suggestions four chapters are offered: Confucianism in Chinese History, Confucianism as Moral Philosophy, Buddhism and Its Cultural Effects in China, The Taoist Religion and the Religion of the People in China. It is not a book on comparative religion, but rather a study of the living relationships between World Christianity and Chinese religions. It is the first book to appear on this subject in recent years.

It is said that one of the Prime Ministers of Japan during the days of the Occupation was accustomed to send his workers to China, each with a copy of the Analects in his pocket. They were informed that the Analects contained the key to a successful career in China. One would like something of the sort to be done for each American planning to live in China. To each business man, missionary, diplomat, or publicist should be given a copy of Dr Wei's little volume. In it is distilled wisdom for living among the Chinese.

Twenty years ago the Christian Colleges of China were staffed and administered by missionary scholars. Today their administration and instruction is largely Chinese. This transfer of leadership has begun to pay dividends. This book is the attempt of a Chinese Christian leader to discharge a responsibility that World Christianity has laid upon him. He has not failed us and for that we should be grateful.

—J. Hundley Wiley
University of Richmond

News

HAMILTON, N. Y. — Climaxing 12 years of research and writing, volume one of **A Baptist Bibliography** projected to fill 25 volumes has been completed by Edward C. Starr, curator of the Samuel Colgate Baptist Historical Collection at Colgate University, and published by the Judson Press, Philadelphia. The project is sponsored by the university.

Volume one, covering only authors whose names begin with A, includes 2,500 of the 70,000 references which Mr. Starr has compiled for listing in the completed series. He reports that the B section is three times as extensive, but will be published in two volumes. Some sections, such as I-J-K, will be combined.

First work of its kind attempted in the United States, **A Baptist Bibliography** represents a wide cross section of religious opinion since 1590 inasmuch as it covers materials written against Baptists and the Baptist position as well as materials written by Baptists.

The bibliography, according to Mr. Starr, is expected to be especially useful to researchers in theology, philosophy, history and the social sciences. The A section alone covers almost 1,000 subjects, among them amusements, crime, dancing, divorce, levity, profanity, secret societies and smoking.

More than 30 Baptists seminaries and colleges have cooperated with Mr. Starr to make the bibliography possible and, through the generosity of Russell Colgate, New York City, Mr. and Mrs. Starr were able to spend several months in Washington checking their listings against those in the Library of Congress.

According to Mr. Starr, more than 40 per cent of the works listed in the new volume are on file in the Samuel Colgate Baptist Historical Collection which, with 17,000 volumes and 150,000 pamphlets, is now the largest collection of Baptist materials in North America.

Newly Published

HARPER

Books for 1948

Pillars of Faith

Nels F. S. Ferre'

An acknowledged leader in theological thought in America turns in this refreshingly new book to a simple exposition of five pillars which support the Christian today. A needed guide to clear thinking about religion. $1.50

The Kingship of Christ

W. A. Visser 'T Hooft

The secretary of the World Council of Churches, conversant with the ferment in European theology today, makes an important contribution to contemporary religious thought in a realignment of thought and action following the role of Christ as King. $1.75

Books of Faith and Power

John T. McNeill

Six classics of Protestantism are here interpreted in their historical and religious setting and the lives of their famous authors: Martin Luther, John Calvin, Richard Hooker, William Law, John Bunyan and John Wesley. "Comes very near to being an essential volume on the shelf of every minister."—*Pulpit Book Club Bulletin.* $2.00

These Shared His Passion, Cross and Power

Edwin McNeill Poteat

An omnibus edition of three books on the Forty Days, designed for meditations and services. Now the reader may follow, in a single volume, the events of the trial, crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus, seen through the lives of the key figures in those weeks. $1.95

Revive Thy Church Beginning With Me

Samuel M. Shoemaker

Dr. Shoemaker, popular author, calls this new book for pre-Easter reading a "how" book. Here he puts down, in direct, conversational style, some of the ways and means that he has found, in his long fruitful ministry, effective for genuine Christian living. It is a book on evangelism, written to inspire both clergy and laity to revitalize their own faith and to make that faith contagious to others. $1.50

at your bookseller

HARPER & BROTHERS

49 E. 33rd Street New York 16, New York

CHRISTIAN FRONTIERS

E286

U. N. C.
CAROLINA ROOM

FEBRUARY, 1948

In This Issue:

MAR 10 1948

DO THEY "KNOW" THE BIBLE? ..... **Dr. Almonte C. Howell**

A LAYMAN SPEAKS TO YOUNG PREACHERS ..... **Josephus Daniels**

ATOMS AND MEN ..... **Professor Carl T. Bahner**

RENDER UNTO CAESAR ..... **Professor R. F. Howes**

Publication of the Baptist Book Club, Incorporated

CHRISTIAN FRONTIERS

A Journal of Baptist Life and Thought

Vol. II FEBRUARY, 1948 No.

EDITORIAL BOARD

WILLIAM W. FINLATOR, *Editor-in-Chief*
MARJORIE E. MOORE, *Advisory Editor*
J. O. BAILEY, *Managing Editor*
ALMONTE C. HOWELL, *Book Editc*
SARA LOWERY, *Poetry Editor*

SOUTHWIDE ADVISORY COUNCIL

W. O. CARVER, LOUISVILLE, KY.
H. B. CROSS, NASHVILLE, TENN.
GEORGE B. CUTTEN, CHAPEL HILL, N. C.
J. M. DAWSON, WASHINGTON, D. C.
CLYDE V. HICKERSON, RICHMOND, VA.
EDWARD H. PRUDEN, WASHINGTON, D. C.
J. C. WILKINSON, ATHENS, GA.
SWAN HAYWORTH, VICKSBURG, MISS.
WITHROW T. HOLLAND, HAYNESVILLE, L
ADIEL J. MONCRIEF, ST. JOSEPH, MO.
BLAKE SMITH, AUSTIN, TEXAS
HUBERT R. HOWARD, JR., TULSA, OKLA.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

LEE C. SHEPPARD, *Chairman*
FRED B. HELMS
CARL LEE OUSLEY
R. K. REDWINE
JOHN MCGINNIS
A. C. MCCALL
WILBUR W. HUTCHINS

CONTENTS

Editorials 22
Do They "Know" the Bible? ..... Dr. Almonte C. Howell .. 22
A Layman Speaks to Young Preachers ..... Josephus Daniels 22
Atoms and Men ..... Professor Carl T. Bahner 23
Render Unto Caesar ..... Professor R. F. Howes 23
Book Reviews 23

Christian Frontiers is published monthly (except July and August) by the Baptist Book Club, a non-profit fellowship of ministers and laymen. Address all correspondence to Box 508, Chapel Hill, North Carolina. Copyright 1946 by the Baptist Book Club. Entered as second class matter February 6, 1947 at the post office at Chapel Hill, N. C. under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription price, two dollars a year; twenty-five cents a copy Printed by The Graphic Press, Inc., Raleigh, North Carolina.

EDITORIALS

OF MAKING MANY BOOKS

Christian Frontiers, founded and operated by a book club, is naturally book-review conscious. Its editors desire to publish reviews of the best current literature, especially books bearing upon religion. Since the observation of the mournful preacher that there is no end of making many books is abundantly true today, the task of bringing the attention of our readers to only the best books calls for discrimination. Pursuant of this policy our book editor, Professor A. C. Howell, of the Department of English of the University of North Carolina, is receiving books from the publishing houses and mailing them to our book members and other friends with a request for reviews. Professor Howell will be happy to receive unsolicited reviews from any subscriber.

SPEAK NOW OR ELSE HEREAFTER FOREVER . . .

Christian Frontiers has frequently spoken, we fear, with insufficient meekness, but never with any pretension to oracular wisdom. We have tried to make **Christian Frontiers** an organ for unfettered expression, and at the same time to state positive editorial opinions on many of the issues, often controversial, of our day. To do otherwise would be to forfeit our fundamental **raison d' etre.** However, the best-intentioned "free" publications have stumbled into the pitfalls of the "illiberalism of liberalism." Our tone may seem at times exalted, our methods cocksure. There is no better corrective to this tendency than a stream of letters from objecting and even outraged readers offering protests and expressing counter opinions. Although space is limited, we invite our readers to write our peoples' forum, not only out of disagreement and indignation, but also out of responsibility.

JOSEPHUS DANIELS

Appearing in this issue is an address delivered by the late Josephus Daniels, a few months before his death in January, to the young ministers of the North Carolina Methodist Conference. **Christian Frontiers** is grateful to his son, Jonathan Daniels, for permission to print this address. It is a message from a gallant-hearted layman to gallant-hearted ministers. Daniels's eight "don'ts" to ministers have something of a classic touch to them and ought somehow to find their way into the Lyman Abbott Lectures on Preaching, just as Congressmen, with far less justification, incorporate speeches in the Congressional Record.

No layman could be more qualified than Mr. Daniels for such an address. Among the many tributes paid this venerable editor and statesman, too little reference has been made to his church statesmanship. Yet he brought to his church, on both local and denominational levels, the same energies, wisdom, and devotion with which he transformed a small city newspaper into an institution or served his country as Secretary of the Navy and Ambassador. In councils and in conferences the Methodist Church has had for over two generations no wiser, abler, or more willing servant. The man who held public office under every Democratic president since the Civil War was a pillar in Methodism. We get an insight into this loyalty and leadership from his words: "I can truly say that if the voice of God had called me to the ministry in my young manhood, as my Mother hoped, I would have gladly said, 'Here am I. Send me'."

COLLEGE HEADS VOTE AGAINST UMT

It seems the fashion to quote Arnold Toynbee. In his discussion of the growth of civilizations the reflective

British historian writes: "Times of trouble produce militarism, which is a perversion of the human spirit in the channels of mutual destruction, and the most successful militarist becomes, as a rule, the founder of a universal state. Geographical expansion is a by-product of this militarism . . . Militarism . . . has become by far the commonest cause of the breakdown of civilizations during the last four to five millennia that are on record up to the present time. Militarism breaks a civilization down by causing the local states into which the society is articulated to collide with one another in destructive fratricidal conflicts."

Dr. Toynbee's colleagues in the United States evidently incline to this view, if the recent action of the Association of American Colleges is representative. Meeting in Cincinnati on January 13, the Association, representing 700 liberal arts institutions, voted 219 to 69 against universal military training. The voting came after a spirited debate during which Dr. Harold W. Dodds, President of Princeton, and a former member of President Truman's Advisory Commission on UMT, pleaded for support of peacetime military training on the grounds of absolute necessity. "There is no question in my mind," said Dr. Dodds, "that America must engage for a time in power politics. In my opinion, the real issue turns on how we are to use our power, not on whether or not we should exert power."

The educators however were in no mood to trust even America with such unprecedented power. They agreed with Dr. Alexander Guerry, President of the University of the South (Sewanee), that under UMT the Federal Government and the military would so extend their control over the lives of the people as ultimately to take away all freedom. "Little by little they will destroy our initiative, our independence, our differences and diversities, which are, with unity, the source of our strength and greatness, and lead us into more and more regimentation." UMT at this time, argued Dr. Guerry, would amount almost to an open declaration on our part of the inevitability of war.

The Association did not oppose military preparedness. On the contrary it demanded an adequate and a thoroughly equipped Army, Navy, and Air Force. And in rejecting UMT the Association meant peacetime conscription.

"At this time," incidentally, was the phrase used by the Executive Committee of the Federal Council when it voted 28 to 14 against UMT. But the action does commit the leadership in American higher education to opposition to any ethic or practice of peacetime militarism. To quote Dr. Guerry again, the arguments that military training makes for better citizens are "so wrong and misleading that they are proof in part of our impending misfortune if this nation adopts a program of compulsory military service."

On this issue the leaders of education and church have joined hands. Not one of the 25 leading denominations of the Federal Council has approved peacetime conscription, and 12 have officially rejected it at their last conventions. The stand of the nuclear physicists is now known to all. The lines are being drawn. With the "red" scare being whipped up into a phobia, with the Army admitting that some of its funds have been diverted for UMT propaganda, with the obvious and growing alliance of concentrated wealth, Government, and the military, we begin to see things squaring off. More clearly each day we are learning who's who in the UMT issue in America. This is congressional election year. The American people have got to make up their minds on militarism. The controversial issue will soon be on the floor of Congress. The people must act, and the time is short.

HOW STRONG IS CATHOLICISM IN AMERICA?

Protestants in general fear that the Roman Catholic Church in America is enjoying unprecedented growth. The

way the Catholic Church "makes news" in the military, press, radio, and movies, the success it enjoys in securing the status of a privileged group with regard to Federal funds and recognition, and the influence it exerts upon our national policies all intensify this fear. Statements as to the actual strength of this church are conflicting, some attributing astronomical growth and some underestimating its amazing viality. The 125th annual directory offers these data for 1947: Today there are 25,268,173 Catholics in America, which represents an increase of 866,049 over the preceding year. There are 100 American dioceses with a hierarchy of 4 Cardinals, 20 archbishops, and 138 bishops. The clergy includes 40,470 priests, 6,938 brothers in various orders and 140,563 nuns. There were 100,628 adult baptisms last year. (Where these converts came from is a matter of interesting speculation.) The Roman Catholic educational institutions includes: 415 seminaries with 23,135 students; 216 colleges and universities with 175,120 students; 20,431 high schools with 502,967 students; and 8,167 elementary schools with 2,185,565 students.

Four American cities report a Catholic population in excess of one million:

Brooklyn	1,111,446
Chicago	1,716,536
Boston	1,208,089
New York	1,169,376

To read these figures is to understand the unceasing pressure campaigns this Church makes for public funds to support her institutions. Naive indeed is he who sees no further than the apparently harmless requests for textbooks and bus transportation at government expense. To read these figures is to understand why Myron Taylor remains at the Vatican in spite of Baptist President Truman's repeated reassurances. To read these figures is to understand the grappling hooks of censorship and boycott which this Church has on movies, radios, the press, and the military. Such groups, incidentally, are made-to-order for exploitation by a uniform and highly organized group—which has a soul. These figures represent unity, vitality, and power, and they speak a language every politician understands. They go a long way toward answering the question "Can Catholicism win America?"

PAOAUFSOCAS

We agree with the **Christian Century** that this new body should not submit to the "alphabetizing fad," but should continue to call itself Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State until some shorter name is found. Here is the most wholesome and potentially the most effective response to date to the growing threat of Catholic political influence to the traditional religious liberties of our land. The organization has issued a magnificient Manifesto which merits a careful study. No one can accuse such nationally respected persons as Dr. John A. Mackay, Bishop G. Bomley Oxnam, and Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison of biogtry and Ku Klux Klanism, though "wolves in sheep's clothing" is the intemperate phrase employed by the Knights of Columbus to characterize these signers. Southern Baptists take pride to count among the signers Dr. Louie D. Newton, Dr. J. M. Dawson, and Dr. E. McNeill Poteat, formerly Pastor of the Pullen Memorial Church, Raleigh, and chairman of the committee. This body, representative of American protestantism, is not being organized any too soon. There are some things, brethren, too big to handle by ourselves.

MERGER OF NORTHERN BAPTISTS AND DISCIPLES

Another American church merger is on the horizon. The Northern Baptist Convention, meeting last May in Atlantic City, raised its Committee on Relations with the Disciples of Christ to the status of Convention Commission of Fifteen. The purpose of this commission is specific: "To explore and examine the contents of faith and polity of Baptists and Disciples in order

to discuss the possibilities of union." Eighteen years ago the merger was also almost approved when the Northern Baptists met in Cleveland, and only the determined and impassioned plea of one speaker for the minority report prevented approval. Today the union—or more correctly the reunion, since the two groups split in 1827—seems inevitable.

Writing in the January issue of **Missions,** Dr. Hillyer H. Stratton calls attention to the common heritage of the two communions. Historically the Baptists and Disciples have enjoyed an uninterrupted common heritage of four cardinal principles:

1. Authority of the Bible. "The Bible for us is not a book of magic. It is the eternal word of God. We can even say it is infallible; not necessarily infallible science, or infallible biology, but it is an infallible guide to God. Whether we are liberals or conservatives, that is the only infallibility that ultimately matters. From the beginning, we Baptists have made the Bible authoritative in matters of faith and practice . . . The Disciples have probably laid more emphasis upon the letter of the New Testament than have the Baptists . . . This common heritage of loyalty to the revealed will of God in the Bible ought to enhance our sense of oneness, for we stand with unity here."

2. Believers' baptism. Here Dr. Stratton points out that while both branches of the Christian faith practice immersion, accepting the symbolism of death, burial, and resurrection, the important thing to remember is the insistence of each not upon the mode but upon the candidate. That is, both Baptists and Disciples have historically repudiated infant baptism. "It comes as a surprise to many Baptists and Disciples to learn that early English Baptists sprinkled. From 1607 to 1640, our English forebears knew no other mode than the common mode of sprinkling. Their contention was for baptism **upon** a confession of faith . . . It was not until certain Baptists later realized that the word **baptizo** from the Greek Testament meant immerse that they began the practice of immersion which all Baptists and Disciples have followed since . . . We stand with unity here in contending for believers' baptism."

3. Priesthood of believers. Dr. Stratton refers to this cardinal principle as "democracy in religion . . . a holy heritage which insists that every individual has the right of approaching God himself." The spirit of this doctrine has breathed into these two bodies a tradtional independence and the confidence that people, given the facts, will vote wisely in the matters of the church. "We stand with unity for democracy in religion."

4. Religious liberty with its strong emphasis upon separation of Church and State. In commenting on this doctrine, Dr. Stratton limits his discussion to the recent decision of the Supreme Court upholding the spending of public funds to transport Catholics to parochial schools. He ends: "We stand with unity for religious liberty. May God help us to know we are one."

Dr. Stratton suggests that Baptists and Disciples alike stress the guidance of the Holy Spirit as one of the prime factors in loyalty to the faith. From a narrow calvinism Baptists advanced to the support of Adoniram Judson and the modern missionary movement. From defending an untrained ministry they have advanced to the recognition for the need of the best in education for ministers. And from a pietistic position they have produced a Walter Rauschenbush with his broad social vision. Disciples too have been led by the Holy Spirit along similar paths.

While we shall forbear to pass judgment on the wisdom of merger, we can say that in these great historic doctrines neither of the two communions is far from the kingdom of Southern Baptists.

RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS

The United States Supreme Court has begun hearings on what has been

called a "new Dred Scott case." Not in our generation has the Court been asked to hand down so momentous a ruling, due about two months from this writing, as on the constitutionality of restrictive covenants. Here the life blood of democracy is at stake, blood which the leukemia of zones and ghettos has already dangerously weakened. Restrictive covenants are the legal devices whereby real estate interests have forbidden property owners in certain areas—of course, with the latters' connivance—from renting or selling their property to members of specified races. Though Negroes have been the chief victims in both the North and the South and elsewhere in the United States, the covenants are drawn up also to exclude Jews, Greeks, Latin-Americans, Armenians, Japanese, Chinese, Filipinos, Indians, etc., from living in "Caucasian" zones. Thus wherein God apparently set no bounds, the law of the land has in part succeeded in setting the bounds of their habitation.

It is by no means certain that the Court will hand down a decision on this crucial case, since three of the justices have disqualified themselves, Justices Reed, Rutledge, and Jackson, leaving a bare quorum of six. Many informed observers believe that the Court will be deadlocked into a three-to-three tie. This means that the decision of the lower courts, which has hitherto upheld the legality of restrictive covenants, will prevail. This possibility is rendered more likely when one studies the temperament and records of the six judges. Clearly we have a right to expect broadly based justice from the nation's highest tribunal. If this supreme guardian of the constitution fails to act realistically and courageously on a case so vital to the constitution we might as well chuck the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments. Either there is constitutional protection against racial and religious discrimination or there is none. Here is an opportunity to erase the ugliest blot on our national escutcheon.

The United States and the Union of South Africa are the world's chief offenders in race discrimination. Yet ironically they are among the strongest Protestant areas in the world. Defenders of the restrictive covenants are probably correct in their warning that a decision against the legality of the covenants might dynamite the nation's property structures. Undoubtedly such a decision will kill the sacred cow of discrimination and rock the foundations of American ghettos. But when we think of the little Harlems scattered all over our nation, people living as they do in Chicago's South Side, 75,000 to the square mile, with disease, delinquency, and bitterness mounting higher and higher, maybe the kind of dynamite they predict is preferable to the disasters injustice and oppression always breed. It may be we shall have to stand up, like God's ancient Prophets, to see that these structures are torn down and uprooted in order that they may be built aright. The restrictive covenants must go.

Do They "Know" The Bible

by Almonte C. Howell

RECENTLY I was listening to a radio address by a "Bible" institute, or study, or fellowship speaker—one of the sort commonly heard every Sunday. Occasionally I sample them to see how well they use the good book. Certainly one must give them credit for a remarkable command of texts (in the Authorized Version), and an uncanny ability to use them for their peculiar appeals—proof-texts, I believe such quotations are called in homil-

etics. Equally obvious, from what one hears over the radio, is their profound ignorance of the meaning, implications, and historical setting of the words they glibly quote.

They illustrate almost perfectly the maxim that a little knowledge is a dangerous thing. They know the Bible superficially; yet they do not know it at all. They lift verses completely out of their contexts and violently yoke together statements uttered in different situations for different purposes, and with entirely dissimilar implications. Paul's early eschatological views about the imminent approach of the Day and the Second Coming in Phillipians, for instance, a view which fades into the background of his later letters, such as Colossians, are their theme songs. To them being "saved" in the Pauline sense of the term is the important aspect of the good book, and its everlasting message. To them the figure of Jesus is merely a Lamb slain for the sins of all us Adams. They "preach Christ crucified." It would be an interesting but vain experience to get them to read Toynbee's chapter on the dying god in his "Study of History."

These remarks are the prelude to one or two observations which, as a teacher of the Bible, I think I have a right to make in the hope that some readers may be led to examine anew the basis of their Bible study and use the good book with the respect due any other classic of age, authority, and wisdom. That is, to use the Bible intelligently in the light of all the facts available about the meaning of a particular quotation and in its context. And finally, to remember that Christ, not Paul, is the supreme head of our Church.

To come back to my radio speaker. I did not take the trouble to count the total number of his quotations, most of them complete with book, chapter, and verse (though the verse was usually conveniently cut to fit his purpose, almost never a complete sentence); but I am sure that at least twenty-five or thirty were rattled off in a ten-minute talk. I did, however, discover that every one of them was either Pauline or from a New Testament book composed **after** the Pauline corpus was in circulation. That is to say, the religion which was being so ardently asseverated over the radio was Pauline Christianity — not the teachings of Jesus. No word of any of the verses suggested the great messages of Mark, Matthew, and Luke. No statement about the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, no suggestion about the Kingdom which is within one, or the dangers of riches, or the duties and obligations of the citizens of the Kingdom of God.

I submit that such a one-sided presentation of Christianity as is represented by the "Brother, are you saved?" type of Bible use is unfair to the good book and unrepresentative of Christ's message. Granted that Paul knew Christ—that he did is obvious to him who reads and has been fully treated in such a work as Frank Chamberlain Porter's **"The Mind of Christ in Paul"**; yet the Bible student would do well to remember that each early Christian teacher delivered Christ's message to fit his own hearers and his own times. Paul apparently had no written gospel to guide him and used the oral gospel sparingly. With his strong convictions about the Greek mission, he was concerned primarily with combating the tendency of Christianity to degenerate into a sect of Judaism; therefore he developed a theology which Christianity lacked and for which the words of Christ gave him a very small background. Moreover, he was, as a rule, writing occasional letters to specific churches to correct specific abuses which had arisen. To take his words out of these situations and use them "atomistically," as Goodspeed notes, is to misuse them and often to make a general rule out of a specific admonition.

For after all, the doctrine of salvation is not the whole of Pauline doctrine, nor is Pauline doctrine the whole of Christ's teaching; and all the syste-

matic theology which the Church has developed from his occasional utterances reinforced with the elaborate Platonic symbolism of Hebrews, is not worth an atom before the truths which Jesus, our true leader, uttered in those sublime stories of the Sower, the Prodigal Son, and the Good Samaritan.

I wish that half the time spent by these so-called Bible students in searching for "saving" texts in Paul's letters or interpreting the esoteric utterances of the Apocalypse, could be spent in presenting the true message of Jesus the Master to a world of men who, as in the time of Paul, are still like sheep without a shepherd.

A Layman Speaks to Young Preachers

by Josephus Daniels

IN a life spared beyond the scriptural threescore and ten I have been privileged at Monticello to read the Declaration of Independence from the porch of the shrine of my political mentor; to stand in City Roads Chapel in London in the pulpit of my religious patron saint; to serve as delegate to the General Conferences of our church and have part in the election of great souls to the office of bishop; to sit in council with America's chief official apostles of peace in two wars. All these honors were beyond my deserving. But I speak sincerely when I say to you that no honor has come to me, unworthy as I am, that so humbles me as to be asked to give counsel to the young ministers called of God to minister at holy altars. I protested my inadequacy when Bishop Peele gave me this appointment. Two things, however, compelled acceptance of the appointment.

1. One was that if my sainted Methodist mother were alive she would say to me, as I have heard her say to not a few young preachers: "God guides the Bishop in sending men where He needs them and where He will crown their work with His favor."

2. My mother's chief disappointment in life was that her one unanswered prayer was that one of her sons was not called of God to preach the gospel. She would have felt more highly honored by such service than if either had inspired listening senates or been elevated to the chief magistracy of the republic. And I shared and share the belief that you young Wesleyans are coming into the most exalted station among men at a time that will challenge all that is best within you. I can truly say that if the voice of God had called me to the ministry in my young manhood, as my mother hoped, I would then have gladly said "Here am I. Send me."

Not called to the ministry, I have sat at the feet of a beloved pastor, Bishop Peele, and other Christian leaders in the holy office which you are entering this day. I cherish the hope that I have been directed in some measure to advance righteous causes with the pen.

It may be more than a coincidence that today you take the vows in a section early blessed by the ministry of Asbury. That Prophet of the Long Road preached in Elizabeth City in 1804 and spread the gospel in North Carolina as an itinerant to listening pioneers along the Pasquotank River; in the State Capitol building at Raleigh; presided over the first Methodist Conference in this State on April 20, 1785, at the home of Green Hill in Franklin County, and left his footprints on the shores of Lake Junaluska, the seat of the Methodist Summer Assembly. May I not challenge you to follow in the footsteps of Asbury, the

first bishop of Methodism in the New World? He travelled 270,000 miles on horseback and preached 16,275 sermons and left an impress upon our church and commonwealth that has been the human rock upon which Methodism has builded a great evangelistic church. And in this city, where people heard him gladly and where the seed he planted is still bearing fruit after its kind, your church today will give you its imprimatur and your brethren will pray that a double portion of the spirit of the Christ and of the founders of our church may fall upon you in the hour of your consecration.

If I am in the least worthy to counsel with you in this your day of high adventure, I would express the earnest hope that you will be saved from clerical professionalism, which tends to dependence on ritualism, forms of worship and dress, and the belief that the gospel is to be proclaimed only in consecrated sanctuaries.

The early Methodist had a choice to make when the Wesley direction "The world is my parish" became their marching orders and brought them early to the New World. That choice was whether to blaze new trails in a New World or to hold fast to the patterns and rituals of the English established church in which Wesley was reared, but which disowned him when he felt the compulsion to carry the gospel to forgotten peoples toiling in the fields, or mining coal in the bowels of the earth at Newcastle, and to dwellers in the slums of cities where the voice of the preacher was seldom heard and social welfare had not come to mitigate human miseries.

I beg of you to follow the long road blazed by the early Methodists of American — Asbury, Strawbridge and like men — who gathered at the celebrated Christmas Conference in Baltimore to make the Methodist Episcopal Church the first independent national ecclesiastical organization in America. Wesley's political pamphlets upholding George III's policy toward the colonists put Methodists in America under suspicion as Tories, and but for the downright patriotism of Rev. Robert Strawbridge—"eloquent, fiery, and fluent preacher" and other like native young American preachers, that one error of Wesley might have militated against the acceptance of Methodism when the colonies became a free republic. The native American preachers declared that American Methodists had no traditional attachment to the Anglican church and did not hold to deferential sympathy or accept the doctrine of apostolic succession as held by the English church. Convinced that they knew the only American way better than any one outside the new republic, Wesley later followed their lead, and the ties that had bound them to the established church were cut; and, free and independent, the Methodist church grew to lead all creeds in membership in the New World. Is there not a lesson in this history as a perfect answer and protest against the present day propaganda for a union of all Protestants in one organized body and the suggestion that all the nations of the earth be governed by a parliament of man in one World? They forget the teachings of history. There are more dangers in Bigness in industry and the church than any other pitfall—except dangers of war—concentrated in overlarge organizations. Nations and churches are strong because they are "alike in difference."

All Methodists should bear in mind and make it their goal today to measure up, at least in spirit, to what Greene in his **History of the English People** said of Methodists:

"The great body which he [Wesley] thus founded numbered a hundred thousand members at his death and now counts its members in England and America by millions. But the Methodists themselves were the least result of the Methodist revival. Its action upon the church broke the lethargy of the clergy; and the 'Evangelical' movement, which found representatives like Newton and Cecil with-

in the pale of the Establishment, made the fox-hunting parson and the absentee rector at last impossible."

Methodism in the New World went with the pioneers as they felled the trees to make dwelling places in the wilderness. The circuit riders did not wait for the erection of church buildings but preached to the people in the open or in their temporary homes as they trekked from the seaboard on their way to building a democratic republic on Christian principles in the South and West. Is there not here a lesson to the preachers of our day when many people who most need the healing of the gospel do not enter the doors of the church? If the people do not go to church, the call is for the preacher to carry the message wherever they stand in need of its saving grace in the crowded streets and in the byways. That was the call your predecessors in the gospel heard and answered. Perhaps the greatest blunder of Methodism in England after rejecting Wesleyan evangelism, was that it failed to see the fields white unto the harvest that beckoned a dynamic Methodist, General William Booth, to service among the down and out. That failure made the Salvation Army the great independent agency which challenges the church today to a like carrying of the gospel to the unchurched.

Perhaps, instead of affirmative counsel, a layman should suggest from the pew a few **Don'ts** as you enter upon your ministry:

1. Don't be afraid. In spite of the physical prosperity of today the world is in the throes of fear. This is not only true of the frustration about world conditions; the church has caught the contagion. I bid you cast out all fears as you go forth as pastors of people needing a courage that will inspire faith in today and all the tomorrows. Have faith in the future, in yourselves, in your fellow men, and believe that as long as God reigns in his heaven all may be made well with the world tomorrow, no matter how dark are the clouds today. The truest courage displayed and the highest wisdom by any civic leader of our generation was by the late President Roosevelt in his first inaugural address. He was speaking to a generation in the grip of the worst depression in their history. They had seen their possessions shrink or be swept away—many had been evicted from their homes—and millions of willing workers were walking the streets vainly seeking jobs. Dread of the tomorrow sat on every heart. The people were almost hopeless and many were hungry. They saw no rainbow piercing the clouds. The road ahead seemed blocked. Could there be balm in Gilead? Out of the hopelessness of that never forgettable period came the clear calm voice of confidence that dissipated the gloom, which was so thick you could cut it with a knife. That sentence was: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." That is our challenge in this day of drifting.

2. Don't be afraid to ring out clear and true for unpopular causes even if it cuts across the views or interests of some members of your church. Asked the road to political success by an ambitious young man, a wise statesman said: "Attach yourself to a righteous unpopular cause." The great preachers who have lived have never asked: "Is it popular?"—but—"Is it right?"

3. Don't be afraid to tell your board of stewards and your congregation that you have come to call sinners to repentance, to comfort the bereaved, to give cheer to the poor, to minister to the sick, to touch the lives of those needing the help of the gospel and not to "serve tables." Suggest the reintroduction of the Biblical division of duty in the church. Read to the congregation Acts 6:1 to 6 where the disciples declared: "It is not reason that we should leave the word of God and serve tables," so we "will give ourselves continually to prayer and to the ministry of the Word."

The institution of laymen to carry on all the work other than set forth

in that scripture should be reinstated in all churches. Is it not true today that many of the laity have become AWOL in the call to full service, and sometimes preachers have assumed powers and duties that should devolve upon the pew? Not a few laymen—I among the rest—have thought of the church as a carryall with the preacher harnessed between the shafts, the good women pushing and shoving and the laymen lying inside on soft cushions, being transported to Zion with no effort on their part. As long as the preachers permit themselves to be so harnessed they need not complain of the load. They should, with all sweetness and light, call the laymen to relieve them of "serving tables." By so doing the preacher will be doing a needed act. He will be keeping the laymen too busy serving the needs of the modern church in its multiplied activities to fall from grace. He will, also, increase democratization and lay responsibility in every congregation.

4. Don't be afraid of innovations or the use of modern agencies. The radio and the talking pictures are a part of life. They have come to stay. Do not condemn them. Convert them. Put them to spreading the gospel. Moving pictures depicting Bible scenes and missionary enterprises and Christian progress should be utilized in the churches and Sunday schools.

5. Don't preach to empty pews. If the people do not come to the church, the church must go to the people. It must mix with men who sweat and hope and suffer, wherever they can be found. The command of the Master was not "Minister in a consecrated church." It was "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature"—this means to you to go to those who live on the other side of the tracks and carry the cheer of the gospel.

6. Don't fail to bring in your sermon a message that will compel the attention of your congregation. Dullness is the only unforgivable sin in the pulpit. I sometimes think that the lay official was right who, when asked what should be done if the congregation was indifferent, listless and sleepy during the sermon, said "Go into the pulpit and wake up the preacher." Unless the preacher can hold the attention of his hearers he needs to be aroused himself.

7. Don't be afraid of being called a sensationalist, a revivalist or evangelist. The most sensational utterance of all history was "Ye must be born again." It was beyond the understanding of the Sanhedrin and of the lawyer who sought an interpretation from Jesus. There is danger that some preachers will be so afraid of being called exhorters or revivalists that they fail to arouse the interest or hold the attention of their congregation by declaring and stressing the plan of salvation laid down in the Bible. At the General Conference in Dallas a fellow delegate asked me for whom I planned to vote for the bishopric. I gave the name of a prominent evangelistic preacher. The delegate, who had questioned me, gave this advice: "Don't vote for him. He has no qualifications as an administrator—he is only an evangelist." I replied, "Thank God for his evangelism. The church needs preachers who will call sinners to repentance more than it does administrators." The evangelist was elected and proved he possesses all the qualities needed in administration—gifts inferior to those required in a winner of souls. That bishop — like Bishop Peele and other leaders—has not forgotten that God expects to save the world by evangelical preaching that stirs the hearts of men and women.

8. Don't be afraid of appealing to the emotions. I have never known a man to be converted unless his heart was touched. If there is one pitfall today for young preachers more dangerous than any other it is to believe that the only way to reach the people is through logic and reason. No preacher can safely neglect appealing to the intellect. But we are told in the Scripture, "Out of the heart come the issues of

life." If you can use only one barrel of the two barreled gospel gun—logic and emotion—I beseech you as a minister of the gospel first to seek entrance into the hearts of the people. Men cannot be saved by logic though it should be employed to strengthen the impulses of the heart. The early Methodist preachers were not afraid of awakening the deepest wellsprings of human beings. The Scripture says: "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness." If I could give only one admonition to the young preacher it would be: Seek entrance into the affection of men and women and children and do not be afraid of calling the emotions into play. My good wife once said: "I do not wish to hear a man preach who does not make me wish to cry, at least cry a little." She knew emotion was the mainspring that touched the whole being and led seasoned reason into saving faith.

As for these **don'ts** from the pew by one who ventures to give counsel without feeling a sense of worthiness, I pray you will give them only the consideration they deserve. I am sure the Godly admonitions of Bishop Peele, based on his experience that has made him an elder brother to all in the ministry, will be a lamp to your feet, while what I have said in comparison will be only a flickering torch. But with a sense of responsibility I have spoken out of my heart what I trust has at least the merit of long consideration. It is given with sincerity and devotion to our church and with the sincere prayer that you may be guided and strengthened not by the word of man but by the spirit of the head of the church who has called you to minister at its altars.

Atoms And Men

by Carl T. Bahner

"Is **everything** just atoms?" a thoughtful college student asked me a few days ago. It is a question lurking in the back of many minds. We teachers of chemistry would do well to make the atomic theory more clear to our students.

The theory that all things are made of tiny particles is far from new. Democritus taught it in the fifth century before Christ. The Roman poet Lucretius poured all his energy into his great poem **De Rerum Natura,** an attempt to persuade men to accept a philosophy of life based upon an atomic theory. To Lucretius it appeared a true gospel: the good news that man is not immortal and therefore has nothing to fear beyond the grave.

The atomic theory of Democritus and Lucretius fell into discard because it failed to offer an adequate explanation of human nature and a guide for living. The poet argued against the existence of an immortal soul in man, but if nothing is real except the discrete atoms of matter, then a man's consciousness of himself as a single being cannot be explained. The eye is composed of many billions of atoms. How then can I be conscious of the multicolored flowers in the vase before me, seen in clear stereoscopic outline only through the combined functioning of both my eyes? The competition from rival schools of philosophy and the religious systems, especially Christianity, which were able to offer more satisfactory guidance for life, was too keen for the doctrine of Lucretius to meet.

The modern atomic theory is usually dated from 1803, when John Dalton set forth his atomic theory. Three outstanding points in his theory may be stated as follows:

1. All the atoms of each element are exactly alike in mass, size, and properties.

2. No atom can be created, destroyed, or divided.

3. The molecules of compounds are formed by combination of atoms according to a definite pattern, the atoms combining in simple ratios of small whole numbers.

These statements stated the atomic theory in a form from which numerous practical deductions could be drawn. These deductions were subjected to confirmation by experiment. The results obtained through application of these principles have helped bring chemistry to the present stage of development. It would be difficult to overemphasize the importance of these principles and the contribution which they have made to our civilization. For nearly a hundred years they were sustained by a tremendous, ever increasing mass of evidence. Yet none of them is entirely true! The atoms of a given element are often of different sizes, masses, and properties. The most famous example is uranium. Who does not know now that one type of uranium atom, uranium 235, was separated from the other types of uranium atoms by means depending upon the fact that it did differ in atomic weight from the others, and that it was used in an atomic bomb because it had the property of splitting in a different fashion from the other isotopes of uranium? The splitting of the atoms was in direct contradiction of Dalton's second principle. So is the constant radioactivity of radium. In fact, if this second principle were true there would be no electric lights, no electrical motors, no radio, because all of these depend upon the flow of electrons which are **parts** of atoms. Nor is the third principle spared, for we have learned that in many important organic compounds the atoms are combined in ratios that are far from the simple ratios of small numbers.

Our experience with Dalton's principles should guide us in our attitude toward accepted generalizations in the sciences of our day. Here were principles supported by an enormous weight of evidence which had proved their utilitarian value over and over, yet these principles denied the possibility of nuclear power and electronics.

Our present atomic theory is like its predecessors in not offering a complete account of personality and life. Its description of the atoms are scientific abstractions which explain some phenomena, but leave out of account the most important part of reality. Few scientists would claim that the modern atomic theory tells the whole truth. It does not attempt to tell the whole truth. Whole men and a healthy social order must be based on a philosophy which takes into account the whole truth. The spiritual nature of man has, thus far, been most successfully described in personal terms which show little regard for the atomic theory. Let us integrate the knowledge about nature summarized in the atomic theory into a larger picture of the whole of reality!

Render Unto Caesar

R. F. Howes

THE problem of religion and government is again to the front in the United States, where presumably it was settled by the adoption of the principle of separation of Church and State. The tragedy of two World Wars with attending social and economic dislocations and the rise of the Social Gospel projecting religious interest into areas hitherto reserved to law, call for reconsideration of the legitimate activities of State and Church.

Historically the problem arose with the advent of Christianity. For Greek

and Roman, religion was at once political and social; politics social and religious; and social life religious and political. But Christianity changed all this. Here was a religion of revelation and otherworldiness, separating man's allegiance into the spheres, duty to God and duty to the State. In case of conflict but one choice remained to the Christian. The Christian, repudiating the hitherto unitary conception of duty, substituted a dual conception, with duty to God the primary duty. This allegiance justified neglect or opposition to the obligations of citizenship. For this reason, the Roman State persecuted Christians.

The triumph of the Church under Constantine laid the foundation for church-control of the political life of the Empire. Many activities formerly within the State's jurisdiction were assumed by the Church, such as care of the poor and sick, education, and a large civil and criminal jurisdiction wherein the Church possessed its own legal system, law courts, officials and jails, and source of revenue. In brief, the Church assumed the organization of a State and performed many of the functions of one.

These pretensions did not pass unchallenged. Some saw in the Church's extravagant claims the fertile cause of medieval disorder, that is, the constant struggle between State and Church. A generally triumphant Church, partly because it exercised political power, became generally corrupt. It was left to the Protestant reformers to grapple further with the problem.

The conception of the Reformation as exclusively religious is no longer tenable. Luther soon found himself embarrassed by the social demands of the peasants, by the political aspirations of the princes, by the commercial ambitions of the towns. Essentially a conservative, he was greatly shocked by the Peasant Wars and allied himself with the secular rulers against what he called the murderous and thieving rabble, calling upon the princes to cut them down with the sword. Thus he threw himself into the arms of the secular power, a State Church was established in which lay officials took the place of the bishops, and a consistory set up with power to appoint and remove pastors. The religious life of the nation was secularized, the ultimate emphasis transferred from the spiritual to the temporal interests of the State.

A different conviction prevailed at Geneva under John Calvin. To remedy the immortality of the city, reputed the worst on the continent of Europe, a catechism was drawn up which the city officials endorsed; whereupon the citizens were brought in and compelled to swear to support it. An association of laymen and ministers was organized with control over the citizens through physical sanctions enforced by the civil arm of the State. No distinction was made between civil and moral offenses—everything was judged from the viewpoint of religion. Novel reading was banned, women were whipped for singing ordinary love songs, and in 1556 a young girl was beheaded for striking her mother in a moment of anger. All life was subjected to religious control in which morals and politics were fused into one—and that one was the Church. It was a Church State instead of a State Church.

It appears that the roots of the conflict lie in the assumption of two sovereignties, spiritual and temporal, one insisting upon complete allegiance to God and his moral law, the other upon complete obedience to the State and its civil regulations. Were religion a matter of belief alone, a separation might be readily effected, but when it is viewed as social obligation as well, it becomes difficult for the religious man to consent that he will always be guided by the dictates of the political State. Religion may withdraw from social and economic affairs—as it has largely done in America—but to one who takes seriously "love thy neighbor as thyself" such withdrawal becomes well-nigh impossible. Some adjustment must be made. Today as the State ex-

pands into new fields of social activity at a time when religion begins to concern itself with these same activities, the old question arises.

Efforts toward separation may rest upon one of several principles: (1) toleration, by which the Government grants certain rights or privileges to religion; (2) repudiation, in which the Government repudiates all religion, and perhaps seeks to extirpate the religious principle (as originally in Soviet Russian); (3) recognition of spheres of activity, defined in the fundamental law of the land, as in the United States in both State and National Constitution.

Of tolerance little need be said, since what the Government grants it may modify or withdraw as the exigencies of political life require. Toleration, therefore, is no solution to the problem.

Soviet repudiation of religion is historically understandable. In 1721 Peter the Great abolished the Patriarchate and substituted the Holy Synod, presided over by a lay Procurator. Gradually the Church was secularized, its spiritual mission destroyed, and though its gorgeous ceremony persisted, by the time of the Communist Revolution it was impossible to distinguish the tyranny of the Church from that of the State. For two hundred years the Church spoke no word against social, political and economic oppression. A revolution therefore, dedicated to social and economic reform, could expect no assistance from such an institution; the reformers would seek to discredit it in every way, and even to extirpate the sentiments upon which it was founded.

By decree of January 23, 1918, the Church and State were separated and the State repudiated the Church and seized or "nationalized" its property, and congregations wishing to use Church property for religious purposes were required to contract with the Government for the use of the same. The Constitution of that year guaranteed both religious and anti-religious propaganda. Following a decree of 1929, the new Constitution of 1936 permitted the Church only religious worship, but allowed to others anti-religious propaganda as well.

"In order to insure to citizens freedom of conscience, the Church in the U.S.S.R. is separated from the State, and the school from the church. Freedom of religious worship and freedom of anti-religious propaganda is recognized for all citizens."

With the approach of World War II, Soviet policy apparently changed.

"We do not persecute religion by any means [the Government announced]. We demand from church parishioners that they refrain from interfering in politics. The old clergy, bound to the old regime, would not abandon its struggle against the Soviet power and it was necessary for us to resort to repressions. But now they have apparently turned their faces in our direction—and the church is free."

After the outbreak of war with Germany, Church and State drew rapidly together, culminating in Stalin's reception of Metropolitan Sergius, and the announcement of his election as Patriarch of the Orthodox Church. The Church is free so far as religious worship is concerned, but the State retains exclusive control of all activities which concern its temporal welfare. Soviet repudiation, therefore, has been modified into recognition of spheres of activity.

This recognition of spheres of activity is the accepted principle in America. In early times religious establishments prevailed in all the Colonies except Rhode Island and Pennsylvania. From the theocratic State of Massachusetts, Roger Williams fled to the "more merciful Indians," to establish the Colony of Rhode Island where for the first time in history complete religious liberty prevailed. Here the State's power extended only to the **bodies and goods and outward state of men**—not to their souls or consciences. In other words the State's jurisdiction extends only to men's conduct while religion rules in their hearts and souls.

But accurately to define jurisdictions is not so easy. The Constitution contains only the general prohibition that Congress shall pass no law regarding an establishment of religion, or prohibit the free exercise thereof. Similar prohibitions exist in most or all of the State Constitutions.

In actual practice these prohibitions do not prohibit. Church property is exempted from taxation; thus the State renders assistance to religious organizations. Bible reading is permitted in the schools. Plural marriage, though received through divine revelation, is declared criminal. Transportation of children to parochial schools at State expense may be required. Physicians must be called in regardless of religious scruples. School plants may be used for religious instruction during school hours. Children have been compelled to salute the national flag without regard to religious conviction. State universities require enrolment in military courses in spite of conscientious objections. Pacificists have been denied naturalization, and admission to the bar, on refusal to bear arms. These are but a few of the cases where religion and government come into conflict when religiously motivated conduct is challenged as hostile to social and political welfare.

When this occurs the State generally emerges triumphant. Law, by its definition, is a rule for external human conduct, and what the law shall be is emphatically within the power of the State to declare. Its sovereign power embraces every rule deemed necessary for the health, safety, morals and welfare of the State. There is no superior authority to hold it in check. Its bounds are self-restraint and common judgment as to what constitute health, safety, morals and welfare, which is necessarily determined in a democracy by the knowledge and culture of the people as a whole. Where polygamy is deemed inimical to social welfare, it requires more than "divine" revelation to render it innocuous. Under our present knowledge of disease, "error of mortal mind" presents no excuse for failure to call the physician. Power politics justifies universal military service even against religious conviction; and collective bargaining may be held to constitute a threat to free American enterprise. What matters is, that the State be preserved at any cost, and there is no way out but through the slow process of social change.

Neither a State-dominated Church nor a Church-dominated State has any place in a democracy. One enables the State to enlist God and the Church in behalf of reactionary policies and destroys the spiritual mission of Church. But a Church-dominated State is no less tyrannical and inhuman, since the evil men do under the sanction of religion is frequently the more deadly, when divine command is taken to justify the wrong they do through ignorance and mistaken policies. Not until men recognize that belief is not religion, and that men of diverse beliefs, or of no belief, can be equally good citizens can the Church be entrusted with the sovereign powers of legislation.

The religious man is not helpless in face of the world's misery. The good man, entering the polling booth, does not leave his religion behind him. The world of conduct lies about him, and with that he is profoundly concerned. That something shall be done, religion commands; what shall be done only knowledge can determine. Here is a common field where religion and politics may work together. Let the Church magnify its opportunity in creation of desires and resolves which inspire intelligent conduct, granting to the State the means and methods of their consummation, and the conflict of Church and State will be finally settled. There is no other way.

Book Review

God Confronts Man in History by Henry Sloane Coffin, Scribner's, New York, 1947, 154 pp. Index. $2.50.

In the early post-war period Dr. Coffin was invited to give a series of lectures in the Far and Middle East under the Joseph Cook Foundation. His formal mission was to deliver lectures in defense of the Christian faith, but he met with many groups under other circumstances in the Philippines, China, Siam, India, and Egypt. "Once, in China, he flew over hostile lines to lecture in a city completely surrounded by Communists." General Marshall presided over one lecture that he gave at the University of Nanking to 1400 students and, as Dr. Coffin puts it, "The General in introducing me gave a simple and telling testimony to his belief in the supreme importance of Christian loyalty." This volume contains an account of the author's experiences and the texts of the lectures.

The first chapter is an interesting resume of Dr. Coffin's trip, with pungent comments on various aspects of the world scene. He is severely critical of the United States for our insistence that American citizens be given an equal opportunity with Filipinos in the "exploitation" of Philippine resources. He is embarrassed by the hypocrisy of the United States in insisting that Jews be admitted to Palestine, while unwilling to admit a comparatively few displaced persons to this country. He says that "western democracies must demonstrate that their economic and political systems furnish an ample life to all their people, especially the poorest, or communism will sweep the Orient." In commenting on race tension in various areas, he says, "But the Christian Gospel proclaims itself supraracial, and when the church in practice permits . . . discriminations and fails boldly to combat them, her message is scorned as a shame and despised as impotent."

The subjects of the lectures are, "God in History," "God's Self-Revelation," "God's Redemptive Work: Individual and Social," "The Church: the Redeemed and the Redeeming Community," and finally, "The Goal of History: The Kingdom of God." These lectures set forth in simple and persuasive terms the position, claims, aspirations and goal of the Christian religion. The reader will keep constantly in mind that Dr. Coffin's audiences were composed primarily of Orientals who were frequently acquainted at first hand with the teacings and practices of other religions. His purpose is a winsome exposition of Christianity. He writes with clarity and simplicity. The following quotation from the lecture on "God's Self-Revelation" will serve as an example: "Christians have found God's Self-revelation complete in Jesus. But this does not mean that God has ceased working and speaking in the subsequent centuries. The first Christians discovered God, whom they had known in Jesus, to be the indwelling life, guide and power of the Church. For this presently speaking and empowering God, they used the name 'the Holy Spirit.' He is the source of the gifts with which the Church is equipped for her life and work. He is the Renewer and Sanctifier of Christian minds and hearts. He produces the graces of Christian character and binds followers of Jesus in a communion of worship and service. The Church is the fellowship of the Holy Spirit."

Dr. Coffin speaks from the fullness of his experience, with confidence in the sufficiency of the Gospel and a sense of urgency in the need for applying it. His attitude has the poise and mellowness of one who has made a long journey, not only in a physical but in a spiritual sense.

—Cecil Johnson,
University of North Carolina

Alternative to Futility by D. Elton Trueblood. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948. 124 pp. $1.00.

Two tasks must be done if the Christian Church is to fill its mission in our time. One is to deepen and strengthen the fellowship among Christian people; the other is strategically to implement in society the purposes and mission of the church.

It is instructive to see men of diverse backgrounds wrestle with these two tasks. Dr. Trueblood, Professor of Philosophy at Earlham College, who has devoted several years to a diagnosis of the evils in our society (see **The Predicament of Modern Man** and **Foundations For Reconstruction**), now seeks to go beyond diagnosis to prescribe a cure.

What he proposes is strong medicine which he confidently supposes that modern man is ready to swallow without squirming. "Modern man," he says, "now come to a full consciousness of his spiritual sickness, is ready for the first time to accept a thoroughgoing remedy. . . . We have discarded the blasphemy of optimism; we are wholly humble about our condition."

I marked these lines in his second paragraph and stopped to ask, "Who is **we?**" This is a gracious assumption to make concerning the average among us. We are like children who, when sick, know that something is wrong somewhere, but do not see any connection between our condition and the prick of a needle or the taste of medicine. However, for those who wish to grow up quickly and grasp the implications of our spiritual illness, this is **the** book to read and digest.

Dr. Trueblood, with a knowing eye on the thermometer, says the basic defect of our churches "lies not in their divided condition but in their **insipidity.**" We have lost the joy of loyal devotion to a great cause, the salt has lost its savor, and the world is thereby deprived of direction stemming from a great faith. The way out "is a situation in which the rank and file of our people are filled with a vibrant faith" and "by common devotion to a great cause."

The chapter headings indicate the direction which Dr. Trueblood would have us follow. The Habit of Adventure, The Fellowship of the Concerned, The Recovery of Discipline, and The Grace of Impatience.

This is a treatise that sees the possibilities of a renewed fellowship among Christian peoples. Dr. Trueblood's Quaker background gives him many examples of spiritual greatness to point to in mapping a route for us to follow. This route would be traveled by a smaller group than we would like to think, but the idea of a "cell" of devoted followers within the Christian community is a familiar pattern in the history of Christianity, beginning with the Twelve.

The alternative to futility then is a renewed fellowship, a creative fellowship in which the only conditions for membership would be commitment, witness, fellowship, vocation, and discipline. Is this a new order of Monks, a withdrawal from the world? Dr. Trueblood insists that this kind of fellowship must irresistibly result in works. Here again he has the example of the Quaker fellowship to clinch his arguments. In order to be of service to society one must have had a deep experience, an inner light that comes in silence and through discipline.

He tells the story of the Quaker Meeting into which a stranger wandered. After he had sat for a half-hour or so, he spoke to one sitting in silence by his side: "When does the service begin?" The answer came: "The service begins when the meeting is over."

—J. C. Herrin
Baptist Church,
Chapel Hill, N. C.

WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE

ALMONTE C. HOWELL, book-review editor of CHRISTIAN FRONTIERS, is Professor of English, teaching a course in the Literature of the Bible, at the University of North Carolina.

The late **JOSEPHUS DANIELS** was, until his recent death, editor and publisher of THE NEWS AND OBSERVER of Raleigh, N. C. He achieved national fame as Secretary of the Navy under Wilson and as a far-sighted Ambassador to Mexico under Roosevelt. His services to his church were no less distinguished. His NEWS AND OBSERVER was said to be always on the side of religion, morality, and good government.

CARL T. BAHNER is Professor of Chemistry at Carson-Newman College in Tennessee.

R. F. HOWES, Professor of Law at Stetson University in Florida, has previously contributed to CHRISTIAN FRONTIERS. Readers will recall his "Why Democracy Fails."

Library
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N. C.

CHRISTIAN FRONTIERS

C 286

APR 1 194

U. N. C. CAROLINA ROO

MARCH, 1948

In This Issue:

BAPTIST CHURCHES AND THE SOCIAL CONSCIENCE ..... **Thomas J. Lassiter**

A PRAYER FOR TODAY ..... **Edwina Dodge Schaefer**

"THE CURSE OF HAM" ..... **R. B. Eleazer**

Publication of the Baptist Book Club, Incorporated

CHRISTIAN FRONTIERS

A Journal of Baptist Life and Thought

Vol. II MARCH, 1948 No. 9

EDITORIAL BOARD

WILLIAM W. FINLATOR, *Editor-in-Chief*
MARJORIE E. MOORE, *Advisory Editor*
J. O. BAILEY, *Managing Editor*
ALMONTE C. HOWELL, *Book Editor*
SARA LOWERY, *Poetry Editor*

SOUTHWIDE ADVISORY COUNCIL

W. O. CARVER, LOUISVILLE, KY.
H. B. CROSS, NASHVILLE, TENN.
GEORGE B. CUTTEN, CHAPEL HILL, N. C.
J. M. DAWSON, WASHINGTON, D. C.
CLYDE V. HICKERSON, RICHMOND, VA.
EDWARD H. PRUDEN, WASHINGTON, D. C.
J. C. WILKINSON, ATHENS, GA.
SWAN HAYWORTH, VICKSBURG, MISS.
WITHROW T. HOLLAND, HAYNESVILLE, LA.
ADIEL J. MONCRIEF, ST. JOSEPH, MO.
BLAKE SMITH, AUSTIN, TEXAS
HUBERT R. HOWARD, JR., TULSA, OKLA.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

LEE C. SHEPPARD, *Chairman*
FRED B. HELMS
CARL LEE OUSLEY
R. K. REDWINE
JOHN MCGINNIS
A. C. MCCALL
WILBUR W. HUTCHINS

CONTENTS

Editorials 239
Baptist Churches and the Social Conscience ..... Thomas J. Lassiter 242
A Prayer for Today ..... Edwina Dodge Schaefer 245
"The Curse of Ham" ..... R. B. Eleazer 246
The New Testament: For Christians Only ..... W. W. Finlator 247
Book Review 249

Christian Frontiers is published monthly (except July and August) by the Baptist Book Club, a non-profit fellowship of ministers and laymen. Address all correspondence to Box 508, Chapel Hill, North Carolina. *Copyright 1946 by the Baptist Book Club.* *Entered as second class matter February 6, 1947 at the post office at Chapel Hill, N. C. under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription price, two dollars a year; twenty-five cents a copy. Printed by The Graphic Press, Inc., Raleigh, North Carolina.*

EDITORIALS

THICK AND FAST THEY CAME AT LAST

Everyone knows that the Bible each year is still the best seller in the English-speaking world, but how many know that the sale of current religious books exceeds that of books on law, medicine, business, science, fine arts, and biography and that only fiction and juvenile literature tops the figure of 630 books on religion published in the U. S. last year? We have no less authority for this than the **Saturday Review of Literature,** which in its February 21 issue published an elaborate compilation of recent and presently forthcoming religious books most likely to appeal to the general reader. "The range of religious books is great—from denominational teachings to books for meditation, histories, Bible studies, biographies and books concerned with religion in modern life, its philosophical, psychological, and scientific application." The books listed, a number of which were Religious Book Club selections, include writers of Protestant, Catholic and Jewish faiths from several countries. The post-war production is on full swing—but who is sufficient for these things? Seminary advice was to read a book a week, yet 52 out of 630 books is not impressive, and this is only current religious literature. No pastor, however omnivorous a reader, can compass so vast a field, and even the competent book-reviewer must consider a casual acquaintance with the 1947 library something of an intellectual achievement. Nevertheless there they are, and we must be grateful to the **Saturday Review of Literature** for a compilation that fills us at once with challenge and despair.

ONE LORD, ONE FAITH, ONE BAPTIST!

According to Religious News Service, Baptists in the United States have, in gridiron language, gone into a huddle, or in political terms, called a party caucus, and have emerged with the intended result of unity—at least on some things. The Baptist Joint Conference Committee on Public Relations, representing Northern, Southern and Negro Baptist Conventions, met in Washington in February and reported the following action: (1) upheld by a vote of 34 to 1 the recent action of its executive committee in asking the U. S. Supreme Court to rule unconstitutional a religious education program operating in the Champaign, Illinois, public schools; (2) reaffirmed its opposition to universal military training; (3) urged immediate passage of the Stratton Bill admitting 100,000 displaced persons annually to the United States; and (4) approved the principle of aid to Europe and Asia and urged significantly that it be based "not upon political expedience or diplomatic advantage, but simply upon the existence of a need." It is not only a good and pleasant thing for brethren to dwell together in unity, but today it is a stark necessity. Only as we move "like a mighty army" to implement the convictions we hold in common can we have any hope of achievement. And Baptists, finding this intramural cooperation so easy and so effective, must and shall join with the varsity teams of other Evangelical communions in registering the witness of Protestantism upon the national life.

WHO ARE PROTESTANTS, ANYWAY?

Protestants have rather generally suspected, sometimes uncomfortably, that they are the upper and middle classes, the bourgeoisie, of American social strata; that their churches are attended more by women than by men; that the growth of these churches is at best only commensurate with the general increase in population and that

their clergy, in comparison with the other professions, is quite poorly paid. What has been only suspected was recently confirmed by a report on the state of Protestantism in Indianapolis compiled by Dr. Frederick A. Shippey, director of research for the Board of Missions of the Methodist Church. According to the survey, laborers, who comprise 29.2 per cent of the employed population of Indianapolis make up only 8.6 per cent of the Protestant Church membership. The oft-heard remark that there are more hats than bare heads in the average congregation found substantiation in the report: only 29.2 per cent of all the Protestant Church members in their community are male. As for growth in membership Dr. Shippey observed that while the city's population between 1930 and 1945 grew 15.6 per cent, church membership increased only 16%—barely keeping pace. It ought to embarrass the members of all church finance committees to read that of the Protestant clergy 17.7 per cent make between $1000 and $2000,, 37.1 per cent make between $2000 and $3000, 24 per cent earn $3000 to $4000, and only 7.1 per cent receive over $5000.

And the end is not yet. The far from inspiring survey has this additional distressing information to report: less than half of the Protestant Church members contribute regularly to the churches, Sunday School enrollment dropped 10.2 per cent in spite of the population increase, only 6.9 per cent of the church members attend evening worship, and an estimated 50,000 persons of Protestant faith are unreached by the churches. Elton Trueblood refers in his little book **Alternative to Futility** to the "insipidity" of Protestantism. Here it is in black and white for us, a church failing to challenge its male population, forfeiting to Roman Catholicism or secularism the ranks of organized and unorganized labor (in the South the various Holiness sects are coming in for their share), recruiting only after a manner of inbreeding and thus becoming identified with one class, meriting in part the uncharitable taunt that "the church is the kept mistress of industry," and failing to inspire even her own members to more than scant financial support and perfunctory attendance.

A pretty dismal diagnosis—but perhaps as we gird our loins to meet the rising threats of political Catholicism to make our witness to a generation growing secular faster than we are evangelizing, to realize in Amsterdam our heart's desire for Christian unity and to throw our support behind world government and world peace—perhaps we ought to know what manner of people we Protestants in America are.

SOUTHERN CHURCHES AND POLITICAL MUTINY

A few Sundays back President Truman attended his church in Washington and heard his pastor, Edward Hughes Pruden, defend the President's Report on Civil Rights as both Christian and democratic. More recently C. Oscar Johnson, president of the Baptist World Alliance, reminded the Tennessee Evangelistic Conference that the churches would not remain silent on the Civil Rights issue, for the Christian witness on brotherhood transcended regional traditions and loyalties. Unfortunately these ministers, and possibly a few more, have been voices crying in a wilderness of ecclesiastical silence. While the politicians, especially those of the Claghorne persuasion, are having their field day of rebellion and revolt (which incidentally may be more political than racial) one strains hard to catch mid the crescendo of outraged prejudice the still too small voice of the Church reminding us that fundamental moral issues are at stake. Where is the social conscience of the Church? Has it been exhausted upon the endless battles against liquor and gambling? Has she no prophets left who have not bowed the knee to the Baal of "Southern tradition?" Why her studied silence?

"Let a man examine himself," wrote the apostle in another connection. His

advice is pertinent here. During these tense days when the South, all the way from the Klu Klux Klan to respected liberal progressive leaders, is shaken to its foundation, the minister of God must search his heart and seek God's will. Let him place before him three documents: a copy of (1) the Civil Rights Report, (2) the Constitution of the United States, and (3) the New Testament. Remembering that the four controversial recommendations are those having to do with lynching, the poll tax, Jim Crowism on interstate transportation facilities, and discrimination (racial and religious) in employment practices, let him discover for himself in what way or ways there recommendations collide with or implement, as the case may be, the principles of the Constitution and the New Testament. His loyalty to both is unquestioned. No one can believe in Constitution and reject democracy. No one can believe in the New Testament and reject brotherhood. But democracy and brotherhood, unless implemented into the practices and laws of a people, remain meaningless ideals. "Why call ye me 'Lord, Lord' and do not the things which I say?"

But this is indoctrination—just what this editorial set forth to avoid. The minister, the Christian leader, must find his own answer. And it takes a rigorous honesty and a buoyant faith. He must be "more daring than devout."

IT'S UP TO THE DOCTORS

The one matter upon which the medical profession, from the local practitioner to the American Medical Association, seems most unanimously agreed is its emotional opposition to socialized medicine. Even in socialist Britain 41,000 of the 56,000 members of the British Medical Association recently voted their opposition to the National Health Service Act, which, under the sponsorship of Minister of Health Aneurin Bevan, is ranked as a major social reform. Socialized medicine, in however mild or local a form, is the abomination of desolation to the medical gentlemen, and simply to broach the subject in the presence of the M.D.'s is to discover their blind spot. To borrow their own term, they become "pathological" about the matter.

Yet for all its uncompromising opposition to socialized medicine and perhaps because of it, the profession by its deeds and attitudes is "asking for it." Its bitter fights, through closed-shop techniques, pressure and purge tactics, and court procedures, against every legitimate expression of group plans for better medical care have awakened a general public resentment.

More recently two scandals of medical profiteering have worsened the relations between a public demanding more adequate and less costly medical care and a profession which persists in regarding its services with something akin to "private enterprise." One was the highly publicized treatment the veterans under government plans are getting from the general practitioners and the other was the neat financial arrangement supposedly existing between the oculist and the glass manufacturing companies.

Such blots on the medical scutcheon become obvious in a rankling sort of way when the public is reminded of the maldistribution of doctors and specialists. In an address before the National Association of Methodist Hospitals and Homes Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam asked why a child in Mississippi, where there are 1,894 persons for every physician, should have only a third as much chance "for proper scientific medical care as a child in New York State where there is one physician for every 528 persons." A young doctor may have the legal right to practice where he wishes, to choose an area where, though doctors are plenteous, fees are sizeable, but has he the moral right? This is a pertinent question, and if the medical associations won't answer it the government will. Medicine has become a big business in America, as Bishop Oxnam pointed out, with six

billion dollars invested in healing institutions and six million persons engaged in fulltime healing vocations. National health cannot be left up to a laissez-faire conception of healing, however public-spirited the majority of doctors and specialists are. The health of the people is greater than the sanctity of any profession. To do the job today will require a lot of house-cleaning and changed hearts in medical associations and local practitioners. Stubbornly to resist is to invite the government in. Socialized medicine is up to the doctor.

IT IS LATE BUT NOT TOO LATE

As we go to press the big news of the moment is President Truman's address before Congress in which he asked for immediate passage of the European Recovery Program, Universal Training Bill and Selective Service. In the main there have been three reactions expressed or implied: 1. The President and his advisors are seeking to create the impression of a crisis in the midst of which it would be unwise for the country to change leaders. Otherwise, it is said, President Truman is certain to lose the election in November. 2. The President and his advisors fear that Russia will, innocently and ill-advised, go too far in their present drive and precipitate a war. Thus we would be merely warning Russia that their present course is fraught with danger, and that we were preparing to put out any fires which they might kindle through carelessness. 3. That the Russians are definitely bent on armed conquest of Europe and that war is imminent; therefore, we are preparing to fight, and it is the duty of every good citizen to follow the proposals which our President has made.

About each of these opinions we are not well enough informed to pass final judgement. The first one based on political expediency is almost too cynical to be plausible. The second, using a psychology of fear to halt aggression is almost sure to fail (any analysis of the use of fear shows negative results). The third based on actual warfare offers no hope whatsoever since another war would be too terrible in its consequences to leave any country with enough strength to rebuild the remaining aspects of civilization. It is too bad that President Truman did not find some possible alternative approach to the problem of dealing with the Russians.

From what we have been told, the Russian leaders are out to win control of the world of Communist dominion even if it means another war. But also we know that the masses of Russian people find the prospects for war as distasteful as we ourselves. Therefore we are under the terrible obligation to set our own house in order, to make freedom ring from our shores, so that not only the Russian people, but all Europeans and Asiatics will trust us to aim for peaceful means of restoring hope and of rehabiliting life.—**J.C.H.**

Baptist Churches and the Social Conscience

By Thomas J. Lassiter

ONE night last year a Baptist minister in a Southern town reviewed for the women of the missionary society the disquieting book on the Negro problem which author T. B. Maston called appropriately, "Of One." Next day one of the most faithful attendants at church meetings, a member of the society, proudly informed friends that she had deliberately stayed away from

the meeting the night before because she already knew all she wanted to know about how to treat the "niggers." Not often does this member of the missionary society feel compelled to stay away from church programs because of fear that her fixed social beliefs will be challenged. Only occasionally does her church offer any program that leads its members to come to grips with vital issues in the social realm under the influence of Christian thought.

In the same community is a prominent layman of another denomination who becomes exceedingly irritated at every mention of the need for fairer treatment of Negroes. A believer in white supremacy as an expression of God's will, he refuses to acknowledge many of the injustices of racial discrimination.

In a neighboring town an active churchman, reacting bitterly against the President's civil rights program, wrote recently in a newspaper article that the time had come for the people to put an end to "favoritism for Negroes."

The enumeration of similar attitudes held by members of the Christian fellowship could be almost endless, because vehement racial prejudice is not uncommon among church leaders, and in many churches it is rampant among rank-and-file members. Tenacious clinging to prejudicial views on race relations is not confined to the older members. In communities throughout the South, it is the pattern handed down to youth, and one grieves in contemplation of the lethargy of the church in ignoring the Christian obligation to seek alteration of the pattern.

If to countless Southern churchmen white supremacy is ordained of God, the supremacy of employer over employee or of landlord over tenant is frequently taken for granted as not out of harmony with Christian righteousness.

There assuredly are numerous praiseworthy examples of Christian sympathy for oppressed groups, but anyone who is familiar with the South, especially the rural South, is aware that trade unionism is synonymous with sin in the book of many a Southern church member who commands respect as one of the faithful. It is deemed an unrighteous act for working men to join unions and strike for decent wages, but unchallenged is the assumed right of employers to organize effectively and beat down wages.

It is apparent that in no small number of Southern rural churches, among deacons and other church officials who belong to the landlord group, there is contempt for the farm tenant class that is irreconcilable with principles laid down by Jesus Christ. Historically the abusive treatment of tenants by greed-stricken landlords has been no inconsequential factor in the creation of the shiftlessness that admittedly is widespread among Southern tenant farmers. But it is no rarity to find a leading churchman of the agricultural South who ridicules any suggestion of landlord irresponsibility as he engages in a verbal excoriation of "sorry" tenants.

The problems of race relations, industrial strife, and farm tenancy are not the only social issues which are made more difficult to solve because men who call themselves Christian had rather cleave stubbornly to their attitudes of intolerance than make an honest objective search for Christian answers to their increasingly complex dilemmas. The whole range of social, economic and political conflicts, which finds itself out of restraint in these stormy days of idolatrous allegiance to money and power, stands begging for organized Christianity to emerge from its shell of decorous theology. It stands pleading for the church to lead, by concrete method as well as abstract preaching, in a crusade for the application of fundamental Christian principles to every human relationship.

If the church's race haters, enemies of organized labor, and contemptuous landlords were, beyond question, hypocritical church affiliates, then any in-

dictment properly would be directed against the evil nature of unregenerate individuals, not against the church. But the wide prevalence of racial and class animosities among Christian leaders and followers of undoubted sincerity seems to suggest that something vital must be missing from the program of many Christian churches. It is inconceivable that racial and class prejudices could remain totally unconquered, on any large scale, where the climate continuously exposes the germs of prejudice to destruction. It is within the power of the church to provide a Christian climate in which man's social, economic and political bigotry cannot easily survive.

If Southern Baptists are to bridge the gap between the formalities of church-house religion and the realities of social existence, responsibility must be accepted at several denominational levels. Convention, association, local church, pastor and layman must become enthusiastic participants in the bridge-building task.

From time to time excellent convention declarations are issued as ideals for guiding Baptists on questions of social service and civic righteousness, but somehow the influence of these enunciations seems to meet with considerable difficulty in seeping down to the level of the local church and the local church member. There is need for a technique whereby the difficulty may be overcome.

Already there is encouragement in the Southern Baptist Convention's appointment of Dr. Hugh Brimm as a salaried worker in social action. Here at least is a beginning, modest but right.

Would it not make the program of Baptist churches better balanced and more far-reaching and would it not be timely, for every state convention to employ specialists zealous for promoting a greater application of Christian doctrine to the workings of the social and economic order? Such Christian specialists could be sent out to the associations and local churches to lead the people into the Christian frontiers much in the same manner as representatives of missionary, Sunday school, training union and other phases of Baptist work are sent to inspire the people to broaden their vision in the traditional areas of the denominational program.

At the level of the association, the committees on social service and public morals and temperance could be profitably consolidated and expanded into a committee on Christian ethics and Christian citizenship with year-round activity no less important than that of any other department of associational work. Conferences, forums, and clinics could be sponsored to awaken local churches to the need of adjusting their teaching, training, and preaching programs for an effective enlightenment of members in the all-embracing nature of the Christian gospel. No longer would there be the likelihood of confining associational interest in social service and public morals to appeal for support of church charities or denunciation of the liquor traffic, both contained in perfunctory reports presented annually before the association and later relegated to the oblivion of printed minutes.

To achieve the goals of a wider Christian horizon, pastors and laymen must abandon their complacency. There is no room in the Christian scheme of things for indifference, shortsightedness, deliberate subservience to deep-rooted prejudices or the sacrifice of one's soul to expediency. Courageous pastors and laymen, acting prayerfully and always in a spirit of love that recognizes human imperfections as Jesus recognized them, must move ahead of myopic congregations, leading the people, slowly perhaps, but surely into new and profoundly meaningful Christian experiences.

One warning may prove helpful. To specify that taking sides with a labor union in a particular labor-management dispute is the will of God is no more within the province of the Christian church than to specify that white

supremacy is divinely sanctioned. The church runs into dangers when it attempts to specify and catalog either sins or righteous acts. It must always adhere to principles as Jesus taught them. But if Christianity means anything at all, it is proper for the church to guide its people into a quest for an honest understanding of human conflicts and the relation of these conflicts to the teachings of Jesus.

Those who fear that a practice of vital Christianity might lead eventually to drastic changes in the current pattern of Southern society or in the capitalistic system have no moral right to block free discussion of major economic and social issues in the church, certainly as long as the discussion is conducted under sincerely Christian auspices. Christianity cannot be tied to any social order or economic system and cannot afford to tread lightly where evil abounds, no matter what its effect on the status quo may be. At least it cannot and still retain the force which Jesus gave it.

A Prayer for Today*

By Edwina Dodge Schaefer

PLEASE, dear God, protect me. The smudge pots have been lighted and they are belching smoke. I am only a housewife; just the same I am frightened because I have a bad habit of speaking up in company. This evil you must help me overcome lest even I find a smudge pot burning under my window.

So please, God, do not let me argue in favor of a society in which all men may be allowed equal rights, or even let me say that I believe in the brotherhood of Man.

Also please cleanse my thoughts so that I may say convincingly that I believe all captains of industry to be noble, just, honest men. Let me say that the reason they find it necessary to amass huge profits today is that during the war they were practically poor men, they were taxed so heavily. Let me feel sorry for them and let me cheer them on their way so that we may again have great tycoons to whom we can point with pride.

Please help me to hate all labor leaders and to approve all legislation which puts the laborer under the kind heel of the great industrialists.

And God, help me to believe in the infallibility of the law of Supply & Demand. All the good people believe implicity in this unwritten law. Don't even let me suggest right now that there might be a better way of working out our economy than by this rickety seesaw method.

You can let me say, God, that I believe in Free Enterprise, but please don't let me add: "but Free Enterprise can become a menace unless restrained." This appendage would be interpreted as a slur against our great monopolies. The pure in heart believe that monopolies are lovely institutions, the bulwark of our economy. So don't let me so much as aim a verbal pea shooter at the lovely institutions' rafters, at least not today.

As you know, dear God, I wholeheartedly believe in our democratic form of Government, but don't let me, not now while the smudge pots are out, be so foolish as to even hint that there might be room for improvement. Too, put it in my heart to cheer all forms of Senatorial investigations. Let me say that these investigations are just and that what they unearth is a greater menace to our country than the confusion of thought they evoke and the impure tongues they silence.

Now that you've heard my plea, dear God, I beseech you to please get busy and make me pure so that I may be worthy of joining the ranks of the good 150 per cent Americans. Amen!

*Reprinted with permission from **The Saturday Review of Literature,** Jan. 24, 1948.

"The Curse of Ham"

By R. B. Eleazer

"THE curse of Ham has certainly stuck, hasn't it?" Jackson was looking through the pullman car window at a crew of sweating Negro laborers at work on the railroad right-of-way, while their white foreman sat in the shade of a tree near by.

"I don't think I recall the curse of Ham," replied his companion. "Just what was it?"

"Surely you recall the story; it's one of the most familiar in the Bible. Noah got drunk, you remember, and his son Ham made fun of him. To punish Ham's irreverence God cursed him, turned him black, and condemned him and his descendants to be servants forever to the other branches of the human family—'hewers of wood and drawers of water,' I think the Bible says. Certainly the Negroes have been that, and it looks as if they always will be."

"Oh, is that what you were talking about? Yes, I remember that story, but not at all the way you tell it. I have a Bible here in my bag. Let's see exactly how it goes. Here it is, Genesis ninth chapter, verses twenty to twenty-six: Noah planted a vineyard, drank of the wine, was drunken, was uncovered. Ham saw it and told his brothers. And Noah awoke and said, 'Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren.' That's the story, isn't it?"

"Yes, that's it," said Jackson eagerly; "just as I told you."

"And yet quite different from what you told me, isn't it? Your version was right in part, but totally wrong, it seems to me, on every important point."

"I don't see that, at all," replied Jackson.

"Well, in the first place, observe that no curse whatever was pronounced on Ham. It was his son Canaan at whom the curse was directed, and Canaan was wholly innocent, so far as the record indicates. Hardly fair, would you say?"

"Oh, yes, I remember now. It was Canaan, not Ham, whom God cursed."

"Wait a minute! 'Whom God cursed,' you say? I don't remember it that way."

"Why, of course it was God who cursed him. Noah had no right to curse anybody."

"No, I think not myself. But God certainly didn't do it. Here, let's read the story again: 'and **Noah** said, Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren.' You see, God is not even mentioned."

Jackson seized the Bible and read the verse over two or three times.

"That's a fact," he admitted ruefully. For a moment he was puzzled; then he had an idea:

"But Noah couldn't have turned him black! You'll surely admit that nobody but God could have done that."

"But where do you get the idea that anybody was turned black? The Bible doesn't say so."

"Why, of course it does! Everybody knows that. Turn back there and read that story again."

They read it again, scanning every line, every word, with utmost care. Not the slightest suggestion that anybody's color was changed by the fraction of a tint; no indication that God had anything to do with the curse; no reason to suppose that it had any significance beyond the lifetime of Noah's immediate family.

"Well, I give up," said Jackson. "I certainly thought I knew that story. Then there is nothing to prove that Negroes are the result of God's curse and a race divinely ordained to servitude?"

"Not a thing," his friend replied. "Nothing even to suggest it. Furthermore, there's no reason to suppose that the inhabitants of Africa descended from Canaan at all. The tenth chapter of Genesis says distinctly that Canaan was the progenitor of the many Canaanite tribes who located and remain-

ed in Palestine. Cush, another of Ham's sons, seems to have been the father of the branch that later settled in Africa."

"Then how did they become black?" was Jackson's last question.

"The most reasonable assumption—and a thoroughly scientific one—is that the dark races were developed by the well-known law of natural selection, operating over long periods under a tropical sun. In each succeeding generation that law would pick the darker types for survival, while the lighter types, with less protective pigment in the skin, would tend to succumb to the climate. Given time enough, this process would inevitably result in a highly pigmented race, with the color best suited to its environment."

"Maybe you are right," said Jackson. "At any rate, you have given me something to think about."

The New Testament: For Christians Only

By W. W. Finlator

DR. Louie D. Newton, president of the Southern Baptist Convention, protested recently against a practice by the courts of sentencing young offenders to a term of strict Sunday school and church attendance. About the same time the alumni, faculty and students of a state-supported school in a southwestern state were shocked to learn that a student had sawed off the cross from a chapel that was being dedicated as a house of worship for all creeds. These two incidents are in line with the compunction felt by many Christians that men and women, whether Christians or non-Christians must swear over the Bible "to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth."

Churches are a Christian institution and no secular institution, such as our courts, has a right, regardless of purity of motive, to compel attendance upon them by non-Christian (or Christian either, for that matter). The Cross is a Christian symbol and has no place, as the school authorities had conceded, in an edifice reared for all creeds. The Bible is exclusively a Hebrew-Christian book, just as the Koran is exclusively a Mohammedan book and, apart from Jesus' injunction against all swearing, the Bible ought never to be employed to coerce pagans into truth telling. By the same reasoning the New Testament is **par excellence** the possession of Christian believers who alone have a right to interpret its message and propagate its witness.

It is of vital importance that we regard the New Testament in the light of this exclusiveness and to insist upon our monopoly of ownership. In the hands of non-Christians, or even quasi-Christians, however much goodwill these men might possess, the New Testament becomes compromised and stultified in its central teaching. It was not written for non-Christians or for quasi-Christians. The Sermon on the Mount, so eulogized and idealized by men of all and no faiths, was spoken not to the masses gathered on the mountain side but to a very limited and select groups who in the sermon were called "the salt of the earth." The Savior quite frankly admitted on another occasion that his resort to parables was for the express purpose of conveying truth to some men and with holding it from others. The apostle Paul, who spoke of the gospel as "sheer folly" to the pagan world, wrote his letters to little fellowships of Christians called churches or to individual Christians, and always for

specific purposes. Nothing was farther from his mind than the setting forth for the world at large of universal principles after the manner of a Zeno or an Epicurus. And the book of Revelation, which today is a sort of biblical no-man's-land for thoughtful Christians, was written in dynamic apocalypticisms so that the scattered and persecuted Christians, and not their pagan persecutors upon whom so much of the vials of its wrath is poured, might understand and take heart. The New Testament was written for Christians.

Today the central message of the New Testament is stultified, compromised and distorted because Christians have lost sight of their right of eminent domain with regard to their sacred scriptures. We have allowed men of good will, though no Christians, to persuade our generation that the Sermon on the Mount is a beautiful and lovely ideal, a goal maybe realizable in the dim and distant future, but certainly an immediate impossibility. But this sermon was spoken in dead seriousness and there once were men and women who received it in dead seriousness. They literally loved their enemies. To tell a people, uninitiated into the mysteries of Redeeming Love, to love their enemies is "sheer folly," but these words were never meant for unregenerate ears. Nor was the Golden Rule, so universally appropriated, entrusted to a pagan world. Logically the Golden Rule can mean to the "unsaved": You fill my glass and I shall fill yours; you lend me your wife and I shall borrow yours. This certainly may be doing as a pagan would be done by. Any humanism boasting that it may adopt Christ's teachings without Christ breaks up badly at this point. As Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick puts it, "Christ Himself is Christianity," and any substitution of his teachings for commitment to his Person is a travesty upon the essential witness of our faith.

This leads to a final word. Politicians and statesmen make it a practice in their public utterances to call upon the citizenry to preserve democracy, personal liberties or the national state by abiding by the sublime teachings of the Man of Galilee. The New Testament becomes for them an instrument for some social purpose such as preservation of freedom or national defense or economic security. Righteousness, purity, integrity do exalt a nation but righteousness, purity, integrity are not at the heart of the gospel. Jesus and the writers of the New Testament knew nothing of, and in a sense would have cared little for, democracy, private enterprise, Western Civilization or even a United Nations. Their words were directed to, and had meaning for, little fellowships of men and women who knew they had passed from death to life because the same Love that had gone to a cross for them possessed their heart's completely. Not to save civilization, not to impose upon a pagan world, a lofty moral code were these scriptures recorded but to be "the wisdom of God and the power of God" to those called to be Christians to whom alone God had revealed the unsearchable riches of his love.

Book Review

The Christian Way In Race Relations, A Symposium. Edited by William Stuart Nelson. New York, Harper & Brothers, 1948. 256 pp.

The thirteen essays in this challenging volume make disturbing reading. The work of distinguished scholars presented at intervals during the past few years at the Howard University School of Religion before an Institute which has been engaged in a study of Christianity and the problem of race relations, these essays were first subjected to criticism by Institute members, then gathered and edited by the Dean of the School, Dr. Nelson.

Effectively written throughout, the book opens with Dean Nelson's challenging "Crucial Issues in America's Race Relations Today." His message, that it is later then we think in race relations, cannot be shrugged aside. Presented not demagogically but calmly, it synthesizes the thoughtful opinions of leaders of his race. Professor G. D. Kelsey likewise ends his scholarly paper with a challenge: "The Christian Way in Race Relations" is not being practiced; the caste system, with its intolerable burdens, must give place to a Christian realization of the worth of the individual, for "the well-known cliches, 'the time is not ripe,' 'this will do more harm than good,' 'Negroes are satisfied,' are a stench in the nostrils of God."

In one of the most brilliantly written chapters, Professor J. N. Hughley of the North Carolina College, presents a penetrating analysis of "Economic Forces and the Christian Way," pointing out how a "Christianity which does not repudiate the whole framework of selfish, profit-seeking capitalism . . . remains an ally of an order alien to its ideals," and that "to seek a fresh and nobler ethos for our Society, a more truly Christian social morality, is the great demand of our times." The Negro, he concludes, caught in the meshes of a system which approves exploitation, suffers all its ill effects but rarely gains its benefits. Similarly in his essay, "The Christian Way in Politics," Professor A. W. Hardy challenges that "Nowhere in American Life is the Church more recreant to its profession of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man than in race relations," but concludes that although it has proven weak in presenting the fundamental principles of social justice, it can, and must function in politics (as a catalytic agent) to create a constructive citizenship among whites and Negroes alike. Perhaps the most pessimistic view is found in Professor J. H. Robinson's "Social Practices and the Christian Way." Taking up one by one the evils which grow out of the system of caste and class which he finds prevalent in American society (on which he remarks that "Christianity has little levelling effect," and that "there is little practical relationship between social practice and the Christian way"), he sadly concludes that "it is difficult for the Christian way to find full realization in the field of race relations."

After thus setting the scene, the Symposium goes on in six essays to assess the resources: the Church, the Christian College, the Y.M. and Y.W.C.A., Civic and Social Agencies, and the individual. These essays, by men acquainted at first hand with the problems they discuss, are factual, constructive, but not overly optimistic. To detail them is beyond the space limits of this review; but they, like the others, challenge with unflattering pictures of a situation we all recognize.

A new note is struck by Dr. Benj. Mays in "The Obligations of the Individual Christian," when he urges the Negro not to hate the White, even when fully aware of the oppressions of traditions, but to remember that "With God's help the true Christian can be loyal to the highest and to the

best that he knows." President R. I. McKinney concludes the volume with a thoughtful appraisal of the "Bases of Hope"—that the Christian Church may become cognizant of its guilt, and may recognize that some of the causes which keep back the ideal of God's Kingdom can be eradicated if Christian people will "give themselves systematically to analysis and breaking down" these fears and their causes. Thus "mutual and active respect for personality will be realized . . . this is our hope for the Christian Way in race relations."

The seriousness and factual realism of these essays are guaranteed to awaken Christian Americans out of their complacency. The modest hope of the editor, expressed in the preface, that the book will move the readers to "sit in judgment on the profoundly important question of the practicability of Christianity in relation to social problems" is fully realized.

But realization is not enough. Constructive effort is needed. One instance out of the mass of facts will illustrate the challenge: Dean Nelson offers the disheartening news that for the 28,000 Negro churches there are a total of 327 college graduates in preparation for the ministry. The Negro of the rising generation misdoubts the practiced meekness of his forefathers as a means of achieving his desired ends and is tempted to forsake the church for other, more direct means. As the book shows, against this exodus the best minds of the race are striving. Does it not offer a challenge to us all to look to our own practices, that we may add one weight of our influence as Christians, regardless of skin-color, to make democracy a practice as well as a theory, to make the Kingdom of God prevail in this area of our national life?

—A. C. Howell

These Shared His Passion, Cross and Power, A Lenten Triology by Edwin McNeill Poteat. Harper & Brothers, New York, 1948. XII, 131; X, 192; XVI, 182 pp. $1.95.

Professor Williston Walker many years ago revolutionized the writing of church history by enlivening its dates and events with the emphasis upon characters and persons. Dr. Poteat has gone a step further in giving dramatic vividness to the activity of those persons.

He writes essays on a given theme in two parts. In the first, persons and events are brought out of a world of vague acquaintance into the real world of twenty centuries ago. Scriptural background and historical imagination are used to make life seem real and vivid. Thus he uses the story as a setting for a discussion of the impact of the spirit of Jesus on the life of our own day. In the second part, the first century is brought to this century.

The theme of the trilogy is "the author's feeling that all the characters discussed here are representative of the conflict that Jesus sets up in every heart that confronts him" (p. xii). Examples of the two-part treatment are: "Women who Lamented Him" and "The Cross and Family"; "Two Malefactors" and "The Cross and the Meaning of Life"; and "Simon Peter" and "Power and Prejudice." This method sharpens the incision which the spirit of Jesus makes in the heart of any person who confronts him.

For the student of the Bible there is new light upon texts, events, and places as the author draws upon his rich scholarship, poetic imagination and picturesque, yet precise, vocabulary. An example of an interesting, if controversial, handling of one of the more difficult events in the life of our Lord, the cleansing of the temple, is "The House of Prayer" which centers the attention not on the scramble in the temple, but on the struggle in the soul of the Master.

This trilogy will throw new light on the entrance of the spirit of Jesus into our world, past and present. The three volumes in one, incidentally, make a wonderful bargain at $1.95 for one who must watch his budget.

—John T. Wayland

The Heart of the Yale Lectures, by Batsell Barrett Baxter. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947. 332 p. $2.50.

In 1871 Yale College accepted a gift of $10,000 from Mr. Henry N. Sage of Brooklyn to be used in founding a lectureship in the Theological Department, to be designated "The Lyman Beecher Lectureship on Preaching," and to be filled by eminently successful ministers of any evangelical denomination. Henry Ward Beecher, who was largely responsible for the gift and the pattern of work, delivered the lectures the first three years. For seventy-seven years these lectures have been continued, and sixty-nine volumes of the lectures have been published.

After a careful study of the entire series, Dr. Baxter has gathered what he considers "the choicest of the fruits of these many volumes into a single volume which can be mastered in a much briefer period of time, and which at the same time will be more readily accessible to the thousands of interested ministers."

The book is well organized and is especially fitted for quick reference and detailed study by division into three sections: The Preacher, The Sermon, and The Congregation.

Dr. Baxter has gleaned statements from the various lectures dealing with the personality of the preacher, and his qualifications such as character, sincerity, enthusiasm, mentality, knowledge, reality, imagination, originality, and health. In another chapter he deals with the preacher's attitudes toward self, the audience, and the ministry.

Typical of his analysis is this statement from the chapter on "Style." "Nine of the Yale lectures mentioned clearness as the first requisite of a good style. Still others made it simply an element in their list of qualities necessary for a good style. Robinson called for style to be like transparent glass."

I value the volume highly, and recommend it to all ministers for both reference and careful study.

—**Garland A. Hendricks**

First Steps In Prayer, Kermit R. Olsen. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, 1947. $1.25.

When the famous Dr. Samuel Johnson, of London, was asked whether he could give a satisfactory argument for prayer his reply was, "Sir, there is no argument for prayer." In my judgment this is one of the most profound as well as one of the truest statements ever made with reference to this most meaningful and important section of human life. It says to men that prayer deals with a sphere of human experience that is deeper and more basic than the intellect. It is saying in a different way what the mystic philosopher, Pascal, ocross the channel said in the seventeenth century, "The heart has reasons that the reason knows not of."

Mr. Olsen, the author of this little book, is a pastor in Dayton, Ohio. He is a pastor who takes a personal interest in the members of his flock. This interest, moreover, centers just where the interest of the true pastor should center, viz. in the reality, the richness and the ripeness of the soul-life of his people. In seeking to minister to this group, from the least of them to the greatest of them, he finds many people perplexed, disturbed and distressed over their poverty of soul. The pastor himself is disturbed and distressed on their behalf and on behalf of others out beyond the bounds of his own congregation. This little book of 118 pages is the product of Dr. Olsen's own agony o fsoul in wrestling with this most vital matter and in his effort to bring help to his fellows.

When I read the title to this book I said in the depths of my soul, "This is a book for me." When I had finished reading p. 118, I said deeper in my soul, if possible, "Thank God that men and women are turning again to the Great Teacher—the ultimate Teacher in the realm of spirit—with their heart-hun-

gry cry, 'Lord, teach us to pray'."

Here is the little opening paragraph of the book: "Far back in the dim past of the history of this mysterious universe emerged a new something called life. We cannot fully understand its processes of birth, growth and death. We can only describe it as a power that possesses an inner motivation, promotes growth and has the ability to reproduce its own kind."

A few sentences, then, from the last page of this book read thus: "After all, prayer is the human spirit in fellowship with God. Prayer is the communion of soul with its only Comrade. It is the renewal of strength from an Almighty Friend. It is clasping hands with a Loving Father."

Perhaps the most difficult question connected with prayer is that of the strong and growing conviction of the fact of law and consistency in the universe. Dr. Olsen asserts that the reign of law is found in every sphere—physical, mental, moral, spiritual. To antagonize these eternal principles means defeat, suffering, and failure; to discover them, adjust oneself to them and work in harmony with them means success and happiness. The principles named in this connection seem to me to be in thorough harmony with reality, which means also that they are in harmony with the story of God's revelation of his will and purpose as seen in the Bible. The main principles named by Mr. Olsen in this matter are "absolute sincerity, selflessness, love, and relinquishment. This is to say that one must know all the laws of prayer before he can pray, but it is true that all the great praying souls, if not consciously, at least unconsciously, follow these laws."

"The spiritual laws are operative all about us. We can use them or ignore them, that is our prerogative. When we accept them we find a new marvelous world with untold possibilities. When we ignore them we close the door of the most thrilling experience that could come to us. When we open ourselves to God a change takes place deep down within us, enhancing the world. We see life in a totally different light, and we know we walk along the eternal ways."

If I may express a personal opinion in closing it is this: The greatest need of the Christian world today is that men and women shall learn to pray. To one who wishes to learn in this vital matter, **First Steps in Prayer** will help and help greatly.

—W. R. Cullom

Library
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N. C.

CHRISTIAN FRONTIERS

Library
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N. C.

APRIL, 1948

JUN 1 1948
CAROLINA ROOM

In This Issue:

INTRODUCTION TO THE THOUGHT OF REINHOLD NIEBUHR ..... John C. Bennett

FORMULA FOR FRIENDSHIP ..... Harold L. Trigg

BAPTISTS IN CALIFORNIA ..... W. W. Barnes

Publication of the Baptist Book Club, Incorporated

CHRISTIAN FRONTIERS

A Journal of Baptist Life and Thought

Vol. II APRIL, 1948 No. 10

EDITORIAL BOARD

WILLIAM W. FINLATOR, *Editor-in-Chief*
MARJORIE E. MOORE, *Advisory Editor*
J. O. BAILEY, *Managing Editor*
ALMONTE C. HOWELL, *Book Editor*
SARA LOWERY, *Poetry Editor*

SOUTHWIDE ADVISORY COUNCIL

W. O. CARVER, LOUISVILLE, KY.
H. B. CROSS, NASHVILLE, TENN.
GEORGE B. CUTTEN, CHAPEL HILL, N. C.
J. M. DAWSON, WASHINGTON, D. C.
CLYDE V. HICKERSON, RICHMOND, VA.
EDWARD H. PRUDEN, WASHINGTON, D. C.
J. C. WILKINSON, ATHENS, GA.
SWAN HAYWORTH, VICKSBURG, MISS.
WITHROW T. HOLLAND, HAYNESVILLE, LA.
ADIEL J. MONCRIEF, ST. JOSEPH, MO.
BLAKE SMITH, AUSTIN, TEXAS
HUBERT R. HOWARD, JR., TULSA, OKLA.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

LEE C. SHEPPARD, *Chairman*
FRED B. HELMS
CARL LEE OUSLEY
R. K. REDWINE
JOHN MCGINNIS
A. C. MCCALL
WILBUR W. HUTCHINS

CONTENTS

Editorials 253

Introduction to the Thought of Reinhold Niebuhr.....John C. Bennett..... 257

Formula For Friendship .....Harold L. Trigg.... 260

Baptists In California .....William W. Barnes 263

Book Review 266

Christian Frontiers is published monthly (except July and August) by the Baptist Book Club, a non-profit fellowship of ministers and laymen. Address all correspondence to Box 508, Chapel Hill, North Carolina. *Copyright 1946 by the Baptist Book Club.* *Entered as second class matter February 6, 1947 at the post office at Chapel Hill, N. C. under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription price, two dollars a year; twenty-five cents a copy. Printed by The Graphic Press, Inc., Raleigh, North Carolina.*

EDITORIALS

"MISSIONARY STATESMEN"

John R. Mott, Stanley Jones, and Robert E. Speer, are rare souls but evidently Dr. Stanley I. Stuber, director of public relations of the Northern Baptist Convention, thinks their tribe can be increased. According to Religious News Service Dr. Stuber, addressing the members of the Mission's Public Relations Office, issued a call for "Missionary Statesmen" who by creating a climate in which world peace can exist will avert another world war. "Where are the missionaries who will proclaim real freedom—freedom of religion, separation of church and state, liberty of conscience?" asked Dr. Stuber. "Where are the missionaries who will champion human rights everywhere? Where are the missionaries who will fight the causes which lead to war, and the social and economic sins which lead to the destruction of the human soul?" It is "high time", he continued, that "we commission scores of such missionaries and send them forth to proclaim a social gospel grounded in Christ's Sermon on the Mount." Calling on every church in America to champion the principles and recommendations of President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights Dr. Stuber warned that "it will be impossible from now on to have race hatred at home, segregation and Jim Crow practices in the United States, and at the same time advance the Christian cause very much in China, Japan, or Africa. Along with converting India we must also convert America."

Here is the most dynamic piece of "re-thinking missions" that has come to our attention in recent years. Here is the only hope of turning the world upside down again, New Testament fashion. The same Religious News Service release carried the announcement that one denomination during 1947 had sent out 545 missionaries to 73 different countries and islands. What a tremendous impact upon the world these men and women, were they of the caliber Dr. Stuber is calling for, would make! Our denominational programs, our cherished theologies and sectarian creeds have their place in missions but Dr. Stuber has put his finger on the great Thou Shalts of all Christian missions which must come first. It was devotion to these all-embracing principles that gave us John R. Mott, Stanley Jones, and Robert E. Speer. Unless their mantles fall upon scores of other Christian leaders at home and abroad we can have no hope, to use Dr. Stuber's words, of winning "the nations of the world, including America, to the Christian point of view and away from materialism and militarism.

SO FAR SO GOOD

In an editorial entitled, "Baptist Without Adjective or Epithet" and appearing in the March issue of the Southwide Baptist Digest the writer observes how the most respected leaders of Southern Baptists have held different views of the millenium yet remained "loving brothers in Christ and served together in united work and fellowship." "They were never guilty," he adds, "of making sarcastic flings at Premillenialists as 'fanatical cranks' nor on the other hand at Post Millenialists as 'semi-modernists'. They were each and all simply 'Baptists'." He then quotes this sentence from another Baptist editor: "Let us not make foot washing or mourner's bench, or the interpretation of prophecy about which godly and conservative men differ, a test of faith. To do so is to divide the united."

For such statements as these we can all be grateful. They suggest that diversity in union which is the mark of health in any growing, dynamic body. They are excellent statements as far as they go. Yet one wonders if either

of the authors is prepared to accept the natural logic of what he has written. If Baptist fellowship cannot be limited to acceptance of any stereotyped interpretation of prophecy or insistence upon such practices as foot washing or the mourner's bench, what about interpretations of other portions of Scripture or other divergent practices in church worship? Open or closed communion, for one example? Desire for closer fellowship with Christians of other bodies, for another? A frank facing up to the social implications of Jesus' teachings, for another? Different views of the Resurrection or the meaning of atonement, for yet others? (On these matters many of our "godly and conservative men" differ). Baptists have taken care to remind the world that their only creed is the open Bible and the humble, "competent" reader. Such a creed, if truly practiced, would invite a healthy diversity of interpretation. Yet our tendency over the past years has been just the opposite of this. We have in many ways sought to steam roller our people into a uniform, mechanical orthodoxy and in so doing have forfeited our dearest ancestral heritage and lost the true genius of our Baptist faith.

It is in these areas too that we must remove every adjective and epithet from the great noun **Baptist.** With absolutely no intent to ridicule and without irreverence it must be added that such considerations as foot washing and the mourner's bench are irrelevances beside the great tasks that face our church today. We can only say to our fellow Baptist editors, "Thanks for coming this far. But please launch out farther into the deep with us."

INSIDE THE SOUTHERN REVOLT

We must not allow ourselves to be taken in by the vociferous outbursts of indignation from our poll tax-supported politicians at President Truman's Civil Rights Report. No contemporary theologian has done more than Reinbold Niebuhr, about whom John C. Bennett writes so interestingly in this issue, in exposing the sham virtues and dark motives of respectable Christians. The political leaders whose saber rattling and rebel yells are "heard around the world" were given much stronger doses of civil and racial rights, and oftener, by President Roosevelt, yet for the most part they swallowed their medicine like good little boys. Why then this sudden explosion of outraged conscience and moral indignation? Where were their consciences before Truman? The answer is simple. Under Roosevelt they were dealing with a winner and they knew it. Under Roosevelt the prospect of losing patronage was sufficient to silence the slightest stirring of such virtue in the most noble politician's breast. But under Truman, whose chances of re-nomination have looked so slim, under Truman where every prospect of patronage no longer pleases or silences, it is a different story. So the politicians have grown suddenly virtuous. But let us not fall for this now-you-have-it-now-you-don't-have-it type of virtue. The issue is not basically racial but political. If the recommendations of the Civil Rights Report accord with the principles of the Constitution and the teachings of Jesus Christ they are right now and always.

THE CHAMPAIGN DECISION: TO BE CONTINUED

What will be the be-all and end-all of the recent Supreme Court decision regarding the Champaign, Illinois school case no prophet will venture to say. That it will have a far-reaching and even revolutionary effect there can be no doubt. There are repercussions on all sides. Editor John C. Slemp of the Northern Baptist Convention has wired President Truman that the recall of Myron C. Taylor from the Vatican has been made mandatory by the decision. Referring to the quotation in Justice Black's majority opinion that "neither a state nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, partic-

ipate in the affairs of any religious organization or groups, and vice versa," Dr. Slemp described the ambassadorship as "unconstitutional and un-American." Press stories have been springing up throughout the nation to the effect that this momentous decision regarding the separation of Church and State might result in the abolition of the Chaplain Corps. After all, this ministry is subsidized, and in a measure, controlled by the state. "Enthusiastic accord" with the decision was voiced by the Troy Methodist Conference meeting in Saratoga Springs. Dr. Duke McCall, executive secretary of the Southern Baptist Convention, declared recently in a radio address that if secularization of our education continues we may soon witness law suits asking that the recognition of God be expurgated from the Declaration of Independence, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address and from the inscription on our coins. And, by way of startling variety, Dr. Gould Wickey of the United Lutheran Church, proposed that by the same decision the teaching of atheism be barred from all state supported schools. He has got something. Finally, groups opposing the provision in Senate Bill 472 allowing states to grant Federal funds to parochial schools have felt greatly strengthened by the decision.

Men cannot with unmixed feelings accept the outlawry of religious instruction in the public schools. The decision, as has been said, is momentous and what will come of it at last no man can tell. But it is undoubtedly Protestantism's superb opportunity. It is for us to exploit to the fullest the implication of this decision. The Court on the basis of the decision must reverse itself on its bus transportation ruling. Political relations between Washington and the Vatican must be broken off immediately. The Chaplaincy must be given a complete overhauling with genuine consideration given to the proposal that salaries and support be cared for by the churches. Subsidization by the Federal government of private and parochial schools, in whatever guise, must be banned once and forever. The tumult and shouting should not die until these things are brought to pass. Thank God for so fitting an organ as Protestants and other Americans United to spark and guide this protest. Protestants must not muff this opportunity.

THE DANGERS OF A "MESSENGER" CONVENTION

A year ago an editorial in the May issue of Christian Frontiers charged that "messengers then are at one time mere goodwill boys who cannot pass measures or adopt resolutions binding on the folks back home, and at another time true crusaders of the church, panoplied in authority. The 'messenger' system is a clever subterfuge exploited to work both ways. It is time for our people to recognize it for what it is, reject it on the grounds that it comes close to hypocrisy, and send men and women to our conventions with delegated authority, 'power to act'."

Once again the "messengers" are setting their faces steadfastly to go to the Convention where they will hear reports, pass resolutions, allocate funds and conduct denominational affairs affecting 26,000 churches and six million Baptists. Yet all this will be done not by an assembly of delegates in conference or authoritative body but by thousands of loosely accredited "messengers" who merely "sit in council." Should some proposal not generally popular arise, it will be brusquely and virtuously dismissed on grounds that a convention of messengers is incompetent to pass on it.

In Virginia the Religious Herald has recently made some pertinent remarks concerning the messenger system. After quoting the first constitution of the Southern Baptist Convention (adopted in 1845) that the "Convention shall consist of members who contribute funds, or are **delegated** [bold ours] by the religious bodies contributing funds," the Religious Herald asks how a convention whose membership today possesses no delegated authority can hold

a charter of incorporation by the State of Georgia. "Messengers" really implies an irrelated and irresponsible group, yet the group must have some standing as a responsible body within the civil laws of Georgia.

More important than this just now, however, is the effect such noncompetence of a mother convention has upon her children boards and agencies. The parental authority is weakened to such a state that adolescent problems arise in the family. Writes the Herald: "Another very important consideration arises. It has to do with the boards and institutions of the Convention. Suppose that we accept the interpretation which has become popular in recent years that the Southern Baptist Convention is a loosely knit organization of messengers who represent nobody and who are, therefore, without authority. If that be the nature of the Convention, it must follow that the boards and institutions which are creations of the Convention have no body to which they are accountable. That is, in fact, about what has happened, but we believe that it is a very unfortunate conditions both for the agencies and the denomination. Several months ago the executive secretary of a board boldly declared that the organization which he served was accountable only to the churches. But how can the churches bring agencies to account unless these churches are in fact the parts of a parent body which holds authority continuously? Even the best agencies will show a tendency to act upon the assumption that they are independent. We encourage this tendency and make a troublesome issue if we say that the Convention does not exercise authority for the churches; for then the Convention becomes an irresponsible parent which brings other bodies into existence and immediately releases them from all control. In this unhealthy relation the agencies may assume too much authority."

It is time, we repeat, to send men and women to our Convention with delegated authority, power to act, and, we add, power to control.

(From the Circulation Manager, Charles McConnell)

With this the twentieth issue of Christian Frontiers most of our subscription contracts will have been fulfilled. As most of our readers know, these two years of publication have been difficult and somewhat uncertain. We have come to the point where a decision regarding the future of our publication must be made. The board of directors must rule on the fate of Christian Frontiers.

Those who helped found this journal believed that it might make a place for itself among Baptists, and there have been many indications that it has established for itself a local habitation and a name. However, before we attempt to go on from here, the Editorial Board and the Board of Directors want the verdict of our readers. We want to know whether they should like to see Christian Frontiers continued.

Please fill in the blank below and return as soon as possible. We shall decide on this matter in the light of what **you** have to say.

— — — — — — — — — — — — — —

CHRISTIAN FRONTIERS
P. O. Box 508
Chapel Hill, N. C.

☐ I would like to see Christian Frontiers continued.

☐ If Christian Frontiers decides to continue publication, I will be glad to subscribe.

Name _____

Address _____

_____

Introduction to the Thought of Reinhold Niebuhr

By John C. Bennett

REINHOLD NIEBUHR has a unique place in the American Church. He is undoubtedly our greatest theologian. This would be admitted by those who disagree with him. He is the one Christian thinker who has won the attention of both intellectuals and labor circles outside the Church. He does not have a school of followers in the same way that Barth does in Europe, but he has influenced in important ways the thought of many of our theologians, especially those under fifty and an increasing number of our clergy look to him for guidance. His influence seems to have little to do with denominations but is quite well diffused within American Protestantism. The people who resist him most are the theological liberals whose minds were formed before the first world war, especially those whose conceptions of social responsibility are controlled by pacifist assumptions. It is not strange that Niebuhr is the only American theologian who is widely recognized in Europe because he has come to represent more effectively than anyone else in America the theological revival that began in Europe under the stimulus of Karl Barth. But it is important to realize that Niebuhr is not a follower of Barth or of Brunner and that his thought, far from being a mere transplantation of European theology to American soil, is quite fresh and original, and cannot be understood against the background of either European or American experience alone.

I shall first say something about Niebuhr's background and about his career. He is now in his middle fifties. He comes from middle western German stock, from a denomination that developed as the result of the immigration of Germans belonging to the Prussian Union church. There is therefore a strain of Lutheran piety in his background without strict Lutheran confessionalism. His father was a minister in what was then called "The Evangelical Synod" (now united in the Evangelical and Reformed Church). He was trained in Yale Divinity School. At the time it was dominated by liberal theology and Niebuhr's early years in the ministry were guided chiefly by the liberal Social Gospel. It has been of immense importance for the development of his thought that he spent fifteen years as a pastor of a Church in Detroit where he came in close contact with the problems of American industrialism in the raw. Those years in the pastorate trained him to love and understand all kinds of people. They gave him the chance to become a truly great preacher. He has remained that though today his sermons are usually addressed to university congregations and would be "over the heads" of the average congregation. His capacity to preach Biblical sermons that bring to people judgment and religious assurance together with the thrill and surprise that such illumination on the concrete problems of the moment can be found in the Biblical message is still one of the great factors in his influence. People often claim that they do not understand him but they are still moved and fascinated by him whenever he preaches. In 1928 he became a professor at the Union Theological Seminary in New York and ever since his main professional work has been teaching Christian Ethics in that institution. While teaching ethics he has always made ethics the gateway to theology.

Niebuhr's activities outside his regular professional channels are astonishing in their variety. He has major responsibility for the editing of two

journals. One is a bi-weekly paper, **Christianity and Crisis,** that was founded shortly before the war to give expression to the convictions of those American Christians who rejected pacifism and believed that America had a responsibility to prevent the extension of the power of the Nazis. The other is a small quarterly, **Christianity and Society,** which is the organ of the Fellowship of Socialist Christians of which Niebuhr is the chairman and also the major prophet. He writes innumerable articles and book reviews for secular journals, especially for **The Nation** of which he is a contributing editor.

Niebuhr takes an active part in politics. Years ago he frequently ran for office as a nominee of the Socialist Party though never with any chance of election. He broke with that party chiefly because of its tendency toward a strange form of idealistic isolationism. For the past ten years or more he has usually been found among the critical left-wing supporters of President Roosevelt. Today he is one of the chief leaders of what may be called the non-communist left. He took an active part in the foundation of the A. D. A. (Americans for Democratic Action). He has long fought the infiltration of American communists and their sympathisers in labor unions and in progressive political organizations and he now supports a foreign policy of resistance to Russian expansion. In all matters connected with Russia his chief principle is that Russia should not be treated as a fixed point either of virtue or of evil.

While he was working for American intervention against the Nazis he was at the same time a strong friend of the democratic forces in Germany. He has been a leader of a minority among American political progressives that has worked for a non-vindictive policy toward Germany, that has believed in the potentiality of democratic resistance to Hitler in Germany. His present plea is that the four powers that control Germany's fate should agree on a constructive policy that will favor the growth of a healthy and democratic Germany. In the meantime he would have the western powers give support to the Christians and the Socialists in the struggle against Communist domination.

In most of Niebuhr's political activities he finds himself working closely with Jews for they are usually far more progressive politicly than Protestants. This has led him to identify himself more closely with the Jewish people than any other Protestant leader and he is trusted by them. He calls himself a Zionist and frequently defends the Zionist cause, though he is critical of contemporary Zionist tactics and propaganda.

This is an amazing record of solidarity with many great groups of people at the same time—with the American Labor movement, with the European victims of the Nazis, with the German people today, and with the Jews. From the days when he was a liberal champion of the Social Gospel until now when he is the chief American representative of the revival of Reformation theology his activities have remained quite consistent, for he has always been controlled by the same passion for justice, by the same sense of solidarity with people who have had to struggle against some form of oppression. People sometimes say that the revival of theology is a means of escape from responsibility for social action and that Niebuhr's theology is defeatist in its effect but Niebuhr's own life is strong evidence against these contentions.

While engaged in these many activities in the Church and in politics Niebuhr has written a succession of books that have been outstanding in their influence. His greatest book is undoubtedly his two volumes on "The Nature and Destiny of Man." These volumes also give his developed theology more than any others. There are a few other books that are needed to supplement this major work. "Moral Man and Immoral Society" marks the beginning of his powerful polemics against American liberal theology. "An

Interpretation of Christian Ethics" is still his most thorough discussion of theological ethics. "The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness" is a brief book that shows his thought is related to contemporary social problems. His two volumes of sermons: "Beyond Tragedy" and "Discerning the Signs of the Times" are perhaps the best of all his books to read first.

Niebuhr's thought has always moved by means of the most drastic criticism of positions with which he has had at some time much personal sympathy. He early criticized the optimistic liberalism that in the 1920s was pervasive in America. The first instrument of criticism that he used was the Marxist view of history and of political strategy. He never became an adherent of Marxism as a total system but Marxism helped him to see the limitations of liberalism. But during his semi-Marxist period he began to study more deeply classical Christian theology and to see in a fresh way the relevance of the Biblical faith especially the faith of the prophets and of Paul. It would be difficult to say which came first in this process but the stimulus of Barthian theology combined with study of Augustine, Luther and Calvin and always in connection with the kind of Biblical interpretation that comes out constantly in his preaching, worked on his mind to produce quite a new theological orientation. He came to emphasize quite early the illusions of Marxist utopianism as well as the illusions of liberalism. The Biblical and classical Christian faith became the perspective from which he looked at contemporary history. Always the problem of man's historical existence has occupied the center of his thought. Personal piety and faith in God's triumph beyond history have been kept in the closest relation with the tragedies, the moral conflicts, the perplexing decisions of the social order.

Niebuhr's theology has two great emphases. The first is that the Christian doctrine of man with its stress upon the universality and persistence of sin and yet with its high conception of man as made in God's image provides the most necessary illumination about the human situation. It enables us to be prepared for the sin that appears on every level of human advance. Niebuhr carries his criticism of human pride through to the limit, noticing, on the way, the pride of the men of power, the pride of philosophers and men of learning, the pride of revolutionaries and of idealists, the pride of the righteous. He stresses the pretension in Catholic conceptions of the Church and the sin that is often hidden in the fanaticism of the sectarian. He finally comes around to the sins of the theologians in the Reformation tradition who allow their very doctrine that man is a sinner to become "a vehicle of that very sin." This criticism of universal human pretension is not intended to be a fatalistic doctrine limiting the possibilities of growth in the Christian life but rather a constant warning, a call to repentence addressed especially to whatever contemporary group of righteous men may be most tempted to feel spiritually secure. Niebuhr has great confidence in the possibilities of human advance along many lines so long as men do not deceive themselves into thinking that their solution for any problem is final.

The other main facet of Niebuhr's theology is his teaching of salvation by grace. The revelation of the forgiving love of God in the cross of Christ is the center of the gospel. Those who know this gospel may be released from the defensiveness that keeps most men from recognizing their own sins and they may also become able to show mercy to their opponents. Niebuhr's stress is always upon justification by faith because he believes that the contribution and the moral freedom that the man who knows that he is forgiven may have are the secret of moral growth, the means of breaking the vicious circles between nations or classes or races in history. His stress upon justification rather than sanctification is often interpreted as theolog-

ical pessimism but it is dictated by fear of the self-deceptions in most sanctificationist doctrines whether Catholic or Calvinist or sectarian. His thought and his life are governed by confidence that when men are confronted with the gospel they may be changed and yet avoid moral pretension, and by hope that men may find what he calls "proximate" though never final solutions of their most fateful social problems. His polemics against the tendency to assume that absolute goals can be realized in history either by revolution or by education has caused his critics to ascribe to him a pessimism that he does not share.

In the second volume of "The Nature and Destiny of Man" Niebuhr emphasizes the conviction that the chief need in the Church is to discover a fresh synthesis of the insights of the Reformation and those of the Renaissance. His most distinctive contribution has been to bring the correction of the Reformation to a culture that has been saturated with rationalistic and optimistic illusions that have their roots in the Renaissance but whenever there is an occasion for it, Niebuhr becomes a champion of reason, of tolerance, of the liberal spirit against obscurantist or narrowly authoritarian versions of Reformation theology. When doctrines of revelation become absolutely exclusive he sees in them the corruption by human pride that he finds in Catholic absolutizing of the Church. He is too much impressed by the love and integrity that he often finds among those who work for justice and decency in society without any conscious dependence upon Christian faith to make sweeping negative generalizations about the secular world. In one place he says: "A 'hidden Christ' operates in history. And there is always the possibility that those who do not know the historical revelation may achieve a more genuine repentence and humility than those who do. If this is not kept in mind the Christian faith easily becomes a new vehicle of pride."

He differs from those who regard revelation and faith as a closed circle to which there are no rational approaches or of which there are no rational confirmations. On the contrary he has himself been guided by the extent to which Christian faith illumines the problems of men in history, by its capacity to validate itself in experience, and his teaching and preaching are most often apologetic in the sense that they show why all of the substitutes for Christian faith break down in the face of the facts of contemporary life and why only the Biblical faith is adequate to interpret the heights and depths of human existence. In an autobiographical article written in 1939 he said: "Whatever measure of Christian faith I hold today is due to the gradual exclusion of alternative beliefs through world history." So many of his contemporaries are at the point where they are dissatisfied with all of these alternative beliefs that, whether or not they agree with his constructive position, they listen to him with eagerness.

Formula For Friendship

By Harold L. Trigg

A POLL of the "man on the street" would bring forth a copious volume of opinions as to what the world needs today. Securing agreement on at least one principle is difficult but essential to the solution of the universal problem of conflict in human relations. "One World" implies the existence of a common trait quality an element of similarity which may serve as a cohesive force in the interaction of personalities. "One World"

means One People" or its meaning has no significance.

A similarity in one or more human physical traits has so far been of little value in producing world unity. It is oneness of mind, universal agreement on one or more ideals or principles of action which can make "One World" a reality.

Current confusion in world affairs tends to emphasize the differences of men, and to obscure potential unity. This confusion is inevitable but temporary. It is the result of many factors. World War II uprooted millions from a relatively simple environment and exposed them to complexities for which they had no preparation. The world of 1937 no longer exists. Distance formerly separated men; now, only time, and that is short. In 1919 several nations emerged from global war as world powers; in 1945, only two. They were united in war, but are divided in space. Age old methods of diplomacy are inadequate because present day Russians have learned them.

These and other factors produce confusion and results in unrest in every corner of the globe. Unrest in itself is not a cause for fear. It is the harbinger of impending change. It stimulates thinking. It forces the evaluation of cherished tradition. The frantic efforts of reaction to "hold the line" or return to the "good old days" is the best evidence of the need for and imminence of change.

Liberal pronouncements from national and regional church bodies are wholesome signs, but it is the local church that is closest to the marginal millions who seek personal and economic security, and is the logical leader in social progress. While the thinking of men is fluid the opportunity is greatest for leading them to a discovery of their oneness. This is the hour of hope. It may not come again to those who now have the power to utilize its potentialities.

Democracy has temporarily hit a plateau. Fear retards the transition from the old to the new. The form of government that has provided more opportunity for more men than any other hesitates to revise it thinking to include ALL MEN in its ideals of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." This period of fear and indecision has no justification in reality. If the "time is not ripe", government of the people, by the people, and for the people can die of "dry rot."

The crust of emotionalized attitudes toward differences in race and color and creed hovers over democracy like a low cloud over an air field. All flights are grounded. Black and white and red and yellow, and Catholic, Protestant and Jew, and fascism, communism and frustrated democracy are the low ceiling which obscures the unity of men, and forces the decision to attain oneness or succumb to destruction.

In all the confusion certain facts stands out:

The people of the world want peace. Peace is possible if man can agree on a simple formula.

Democracy in practice is best fitted to apply the formula. Permanent change takes place in the minds of the people and is best embodied in the normal process of orderly progress which democracy espouses.

Western civilization is poised on the threshold of a new era. Immediate choice of direction—backward or forward—is imperative.

When the Israelites received their twelve leaders on the return from a tour of reconnaissance in the land of Canaan which had been promised them for habitation, they listened for direction. Two of the twelve said, "Let us go up at once, and possess it; for we are able to overcome it." But the other ten, although agreeing that it was a land of "milk and honey," said "it is a land that eateth up the inhabitants thereof" . . . we saw the sons of Anak . . . and we were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight." The people, in confusion and fright, wanted to return to Egypt, to the "good old days" of slavery, and for their lack of faith and courage

they were doomed to wander [another] forty years in the wilderness.

The land of Canaan today is one in which all the material wealth of the world would be mobilized for use in improving the living of **ALL MEN** in spite of differences in race, creed, or color; a world in which there is a guarantee of:

1. Freedom from violence and hazard to person from mob or dispensation of distorted justice.
2. Freedom from artificial restrictions to personal movement in the normal course of daily activity.
3. Freedom to belong to the community in which one lives, to participate in and give sense of direction to its forward movement, to share the responsibility for and to contribute to the general welfare.
4. Freedom to choose within the field of individual ability, to achieve occupational competence and subsequent gainful employment in work on the same basis of capacity for effective adjustment.
5. Freedom to build a decent home for a healthy family in a wholesome neighborhood where the churches and schools and playgrounds provide adequately for the rounded growth of personality.

Some leaders fear to "go up" and "possess" this new world. The "time is not ripe." There are accepted measures of the maturity of vegetables and fruits but none of time, according to the ten who are "grasshoppers."

The Hebrew children were granted a period of forty years to wander about and make up their minds. Today we have no choice. We move in and possess this new "One World," or we lose the power of movement.

Economists and politicians have failed to "deliver the goods." It is the Church that holds the decision within her grasp. An awakened church with new faith and courage; a church aggressive in the application of Christian principles to human relations. Men do what the church approves or ignores. Religious sanctions are the strongest of all.

The Church has had the formula for friendship since the first century B.C. The Master told his disciples "I have called you friends; for all the things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you."

There are two elements in this statement which are plain even to the layman's understanding:

1. Jesus taught these men what was necessary to elevate them to the level of friendship with Him.
2. When they had learned what he knew of the fundamentals of living, he accepted them as Friends. He did not assume that they had no capacity for friendship. He did not try to buy their friendship. He did not force friendship upon them. He directed their growth into friendship, and when he saw that "the time was ripe," he accepted them as Friends. He taught them the sacredness of human personality, justice, the stewardship of material wealth, the life of service to other men, and love for one's neighbor. When they saw "eye to eye" with Him on these principles, they became no longer servants but His friends.

It is the inescapable obligation of the strong to provide the situation in which the weak can grow in strength, and into cooperative friendship. The time to start is now. The place to start is in every local community. The starter is the church.

The world powers of the 19th and 20th centuries have had a hundred years to prepare "backward peoples" for friendship while they exploited the resources of "backward countries." These great powers have become little powers one by one until only two remain, and the potential friendship of "backward peoples" is in many instances open hostility. To say that these "backward peoples" are not capable of growth into friendship, of learning the essentials of harmonious interaction is to place one's judgment

above that of the God who made all men in his own image.

The 20th century has experienced two global conflicts. To expect the producers of these conflicts to prevent a third one is to expect the impossible. They reap the benefits of differences. Almost two thousand years ago a Man helped men discover their likenesses, their similarities in thought and desire which made them friends of each other and His friends. His followers have the mandate to do for all what He did for a few, to assume aggressive leadership in the use of unconquerable spiritual power for the building of a world community in which all men see "eye to eye" on the fundamentals of peaceful living, and direct their action in channels which produce it.

To prepare all men for friendship and then to accept them as friends is the age old formula for ONE PEOPLE of ONE MIND in ONE WORLD.

Baptists In California*

By William W. Barnes

THE article by Dr. W. Earle Smith in the June number of **Christian Frontiers,** entitled "Our Southern Baptist Friends," has been read with interest. A further word should be said supplementary to that article. I shall try to discuss the matter as objectively and dispassionately as possible. Some twenty-five years ago some of my students from year to year discussed with me their plans to go north, northwest or west. Some who had already gone north wrote me about the tendencies toward the Southern Convention arising in their communities. Invariably I advised these young men to align themselves with the organized work of the Northern Convention and to carry on with the evangelistic fervor and vigor characteristic of pastors in the South. If they thought they saw any digressions from fundamental Baptist teachings and practices, I advised them to preach the New Testament teachings with firmness and in love. Some took my advice and some did not, as was to be expected. I have said this that my own personal attitude may be clarified.

In order to understand in a measure the relations between Northern and Southern Baptists in California or elsewhere, it is necessary to go beyond "some 25 or 30 years ago," or even beyond the meeting of Northern Baptists in Oklahoma City (1908) when the Northern Convention was formed.

It is necessary, too, to take a look at the geographical area included in the constitution of the two conventions. The Home Mission Society from its beginning (1832) took for its motto **North America for Christ.** In the constitution of the Southern Convention from the beginning (1845) the United States has been the territory from which churches and other Baptist bodies have been invited to send messengers. When the Northern Convention was formed (1908) its constitution, also, included the United States. In discussing the relations between Northern and Southern Baptists in California or elsewhere it is necessary to discuss the relations of Southern Baptists with the Home Mission Society up to 1908 and with the Home Mission Society as the agency of the Northern Convention since 1908.

Editor's note: Readers are referred, for a fuller background to this discussion to the article "Our Southern Baptist Friends" by W. Earle Smith (Christian Frontiers, June, '47.) Dr. Barnes wishes his discussion to be considered more as a supplement than a reply to Dr. Smith's article.

The Home Mission Society had no work in the South (work in Texas for a short time excepted) from 1845 to the period of the War Between the States. During that struggle the Society re-entered the South by way of the military situation. It began work in Virginia among the refugee Negroes and extended its work with the advance of the northern armies until January, 1864, when the Society secured from the War Department, through Senator Harris of New York, authority to take possession of "all houses of worship belonging to the Baptist Churches South in which a loyal minister of said church does not now officiate." The military order goes on to say, "The American Baptist Home Mission Society enjoys the confidence of this Department and no doubt is entertained that all ministers that may be appointed by it will be entirely loyal. You are expected to give it all aid, countenance and support practicable in the execution of its important mission." The Society appointed Rev. J. W. Parker of Boston to have supervision over this work in the South. Pastoral appointments were made by Dr. Parker in Baton Rouge, Vicksburg, Chattanooga, Knoxville, Nashville, Island Number 10, and Memphis. Other representatives of the Society were in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida, and Mississippi. The ultimate results of this "invasion" of the South by the Home Mission Society were not all bad. Many church buildings were to be saved for the Baptists. Preachers of other denominations from the north had begun to use some of these buildings. When the agents of the Home Mission Society proved to the military that buildings had been used by Baptist congregations the other preachers were forced to release them to the appointees of the Home Mission Society. After the war Southern Baptist congregations could regain their buildings, if and when they could show title. It required about three years to prove title to the Coliseum Church of New Orleans.

After the war the South was prostrate. The Home Mission Society, following its motto, moved in. It did great work among whites and blacks. In 1868 the Southern Convention proposed that the Home Mission Society work through the organized agencies of the Convention. The Society definitely refused. It worked through state organizations. There is no record of the Home Mission Society's taking the initiative, but when funds were available the Society answered all requests from any state group in the South. The Southern Convention voted in 1879 that it would continue its separate existence and work. The Society at once made plans for a larger program for the South. In 1880 the Society reported that the work with the Negro bodies was expanding and "quite gratifying are indications of the collective cooperation in a similar character on the part of white brethren in some of the southern states." By July 1, 1882, when Dr. Tichenor became Secretary of the Home Mission Board of the Southern Convention, all territory west of the Mississippi had been lost to the Board. I have a copy of a contract between the Society and the Baptist State Convention of Texas, the East Texas Baptist Convention, and the Arkansas Baptist Convention. In 1881 the Board of the Home Mission Society reported "other requests have been made by conventions both white and colored in the South . . . but they came when the finances of the Society would not warrant further enlargement and so for the time were declined. So far as possible the Society has extended its hand to all asking help, knowing no lines of separation, anxious only that weak interests should be strengthened and destitute fields be cultivated all over this continent."

The relations between Northern and Southern Baptists need to be studied from the point of view of different ideologies as well as from the point of view of geography. There have been two distinct methods of work among English-speaking Baptists. For the lack

of an established nomenclature I call them the **society** method and the **convention** method. The society method is carried on by a group of individuals representing their own contributions or the contributions of churches and other Baptist bodies to a specific objective—foreign missions, home missions, education, or whatever it may be. Churches as such have no official connection with the society. The convention method calls for a body, usually called a Convention, that is all-comprehensive in its scope, having different boards to conduct the different lines of work, and considered to be based ultimately upon the churches. From Philadelphia northward the society ideology predominated in the formative years of Baptist work in America. South of Philadelphia the convention ideology was strong (see my article in the May number of **Christian Frontiers**). That sentiment was the fundamental cause of the formation of the Southern Baptist Convention. Slavery was the occasion (see my article, **Why Was the Southern Baptist Convention Formed?**, in the **Review and Expositor**, January, 1944).

Dr. Tichenor, the great Baptist statesman, planned his strategy to regain lost territory and enter into new areas. His program was based on the denominational ideology in the constitution of the Southern Baptist Convention. That ideology inherent from the beginning (1845) came to the fore under Dr. Tichenor's leadership. For the first half-century the Southern Convention was often called the Southern Missionary Convention. By 1895 the Convention was being recognized as an all-comprehensive denominational body. By 1893 the Home Board, under Dr. Tichenor's leadership, had regained all lost territory. The Home Mission Society had been very active in the South from 1882 to 1896 in assisting churches to build. Southern leaders became alarmed. If the northern Society met the mission needs in the southern states, fostering old churches and establishing new ones, and carrying on Sunday School work (Publication Society), founding schools and supplying literature, within a generation most of the southern churches would be in intimate alignment with the north. Dr. E. T. Winkler, pastor of the First Church, Charleston, South Carolina, published an article in 1882 which was widely copied. Dr. Moorehouse, Secretary of the Home Mission Society, answered Dr. Winkler in the **Home Mission Monthly**, October, 1882. Dr. Moorehouse concluded his article, "Ours is not the 'Northern Society,' it is the **American Society**; its work prosecuted in every state and territory, its receipts coming from all parts of the country; its aim being not to make conquests of domain for the sake of the Society, but to make gracious conquests for Christ. And to this work . . . we summon and welcome with us all who with us believe that what should be done we must attempt to do." In the late 1880's the Southern Convention made overtures to the Home Mission Society for consultation about the situation. Not until 1894, after the Home Board had regained lost territory, did the Home Mission Society agree to discuss the situation with the Home Board. September 12, 1894, a conference was held at Fortress Monroe, Virginia. After full, free, frank and fraternal discussion the representatives of the Home Mission Society and of the Southern Convention came to an agreement on a program.

It thus may be seen that historically and geographically Baptists in the South and in the North have looked upon the United States as their field of labor. Varying conditions, economic and otherwise, have determined how far afield the missionaries of each group have gone. There was misunderstanding and friction in the thirty years from the War to 1895. Ultimately wise and Christian counsels prevailed. Those of us in the South today can look back and see that the work of the Home Mission Society in the South in the post-war period was a God-send to whites and blacks. It is to be hoped and expected that in the extending fields in the far west, in spite of fric-

tion that may normally come out of human nature, good may come and the Kingdom extended. There is no reason why a Baptist church may not affiliate with one or both of the conventions. Some of the churches in Missouri are affiliated with both conventions. All of the churches in the District of Columbia, through the Convention of the District, are aligned with the north and with the south. The plan seems to work well. If there are situations in California not being met and the Home Mission Board can assist the situation, blessings on them. If the work of the Home Mission Society, which has a long and honorable record in all of the far west, continues to enlarge, praise be to the leadership of God's Spirit. May it be hoped that each group will stimulate the other to good works on that Pacific coast, where, from all reports that come to me, the New Testament religion needs to be pressed. Selah.

Book Review

John, the Universal Gospel,
Chester Warren Quimby,
The Macmillan Company, New York,
1947, pp. 224, $2.75.

Professor Chester Warren Quimby presents in his **John, the Universal Gospel** a non-technical interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Though possessed of a strong devotional element, it is scholarly and thorough. Furthermore, it has a strong homiletical slant and offers many valuable helps to that body of men who must ever be alert for ideas that will "preach." It holds strongly, on the one hand, to liberal critical opinion, and on the other, to a glowing evangelical faith.

The author believes that John universalized the gospel in a way that far exceeds the presentation in the Synoptics and in Paul. John, he thinks, "interpreted the life and teachings of the Palestinian Jesus in terms of everyman's experience and life through all time." John's heavy use of such terms as water, bread, light, life, et cetera, is a case in point.

The book falls into two main divisions with a sort of epilogue. The first division deals with background material. Ephesus, as the possible scene of John's writing, is described in interesting detail. John's purpose and his peculiarities of style and point of view are treated. Much is made of the controversies in which the Christians engaged toward the end of the first century with the Jews and with the followers of the Baptist. The questions of authority and historicity are treated with forthrightness and clarity. There is acceptance of the view that John used incidents of the life of Jesus as allegories for homiletical elaboration. In fact, the author thinks that the major portion of the Gospel may be notes from some of John's sermons.

The second division consists of the exposition of the Gospel in twenty-five brief sections. It will have an appeal to many, whether they accept Professor Quimby's critical views or not. Such passages as "Jesus, the Bread," "Jesus, the Light of the World," and many another, give to the book a high general appeal.

The closing chapters of the book are grouped under the title "Varia." Here, besides a chapter on John for the atomic age and a dictionary of his terms, is an extended list of themes and titles intended as a special aid to the minister.

The reviewer finds so many things to appreciate in this book that criticism seems gratuitous, but he cannot fail to point out that the author seems at times to belabor too heavily his idea of John's universalizations, using the insignificant along with the significant. The author does not seem to allow sufficiently for interpretations different from his own. He neglects entirely to furnish even a brief bibliography or an index. But this book will reward in good measure careful reading.

CHRISTIAN FRONTIERS

Library
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N. C.

SEP 21 1948

N. C.
CAROLINA ROOM

SEPTEMBER, 1948

In This Issue:

A LAYMAN ATTENDS HIS FIRST CONVENTION ..... **Robert C. Ray**

ECUMENICITY AND SOUTHERN BAPTISTS ..... **Adiel J. Moncrief**

MY MANIFESTO ..... **W. R. Cullom**

THE PROBLEM OF RELATIONSHIP IN THE COUNSELING PROCESS ..... **Robert H. Ayers**

Publication of the Baptist Book Club, Incorporated

CHRISTIAN FRONTIERS

A Journal of Baptist Life and Thought

Vol. II SEPTEMBER, 1948 No. 11

EDITORIAL BOARD

WILLIAM W. FINLATOR, *Editor-in-Chief*
MARJORIE E. MOORE, *Advisory Editor*
J. O. BAILEY, *Managing Editor*
ALMONTE C. HOWELL, *Book Editor*
SARA LOWREY, *Poetry Editor*

SOUTHWIDE ADVISORY COUNCIL

W. O. CARVER, LOUISVILLE, KY.
H. B. CROSS, NASHVILLE, TENN.
GEORGE B. CUTTEN, CHAPEL HILL, N. C.
J. M. DAWSON, WASHINGTON, D. C.
CLYDE V. HICKERSON, RICHMOND, VA.
EDWARD H. PRUDEN, WASHINGTON, D. C.
J. C. WILKINSON, ATHENS, GA.
SWAN HAYWORTH, VICKSBURG, MISS.
WITHROW T. HOLLAND, HAYNESVILLE, LA.
ADIEL J. MONCRIEF, ST. JOSEPH, MO.
BLAKE SMITH, AUSTIN, TEXAS
HUBERT R. HOWARD, JR., TULSA, OKLA.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

LEE C. SHEPPARD, *Chairman*
FRED B. HELMS
CARL LEE OUSLEY
R. K. REDWINE
JOHN MCGINNIS
A. C. MCCALL

CONTENTS

Editorials 269
Who's Who In This Issue 272
A Layman Attends His First Convention ..... Robert C. Ray 273
Ecumenicity and Southern Baptists ..... Adiel J. Moncrief 274
My Manifesto ..... W. R. Cullom 276
The Problem of Relationship in the Counseling Process ..... Robert H. Ayers 279

Christian Frontiers is published monthly (except July and August) by the Baptist Book Club, a non-profit fellowship of ministers and laymen. Address all correspondence to Box 508, Chapel Hill, North Carolina. *Copyright 1946 by the Baptist Book Club.* *Entered as second class matter February 6, 1947 at the post office at Chapel Hill, N. C. under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription price, two dollars a year; twenty-five cents a copy. Printed by The Graphic Press, Inc., Raleigh, North Carolina.*

EDITORIALS

SURSUM CORDA

It is no secret that the editorial staff and a number of supporters went to the Memphis Convention with a feeling of resignation concerning the fate of *Christian Frontiers*. We were ready to throw in the sponge. We imagined that our journal had had its day and would cease to be, and we were prepared to give it a decent funeral. No one was more surprised than we at the results of two meetings of the friends of *Christian Frontiers* which gave it such new lease on life as to make us wonder at the phoenix-like qualities of survival in *Christian Frontiers*. Obviously, and to an extent exceeding our fondest hopes, the journal had so laid hold on the hearts of ministers and laymen that they were determined it must not die. During the luncheon and breakfast meetings they took matters in their own hands and laid plans to raise funds to guarantee publication for two years. Their determination to increase subscriptions was equally fervent. No one could deny that the meetings were inspired.

Thus *Christian Frontiers* still lives and thus its control passes from the Baptist Book Club of North Carolina to the men and women of the Southern Baptist Convention. That is as it should be. Here is a journal published and maintained by Southern Baptists yet unfettered by any denominational tie. Here is a journal not for "modernists," "liberals," or even "progressives," but for men and women within the Southern Baptist Convention who, while deeply loyal to their denomination, yet reserve for themselves the sacred right and duty of self-criticism and the preservation of a free conscience. And they know from history that they must express these truths with force and conviction or lose them.

20th CENTURY VERBAL INSPIRATION

Reinhold Niebuhr has somewhere said in effect that the man who pronounces "Thus saith the Lord" is either a charlatan, a fool, or a prophet. The percentage against his being a prophet, Dr. Niebuhr adds, is great. It is a fearsome thing to speak for God whether it be in the form of papal infallibility, parish bigotry, or the identification of any economic or political system with God's will. A great handicap facing American Christians at Amsterdam this month is the askance with which they will be regarded by certain European Christians who believe we use our Christianity as a facade for power interests back home in the last remaining bulwark of capitalism. And in Hot Springs, Arkansas, where funds are being received from white Baptists to establish a National Negro Baptist Hospital, one of the local pastors is quoted as saying, "This is the Christian answer to the racial problem of the South." We know whom we have believed, we know the power of His transforming love, we know His judgment upon our unrepentent lives, and we know that in Him we have passed from death to life. But can we know that free enterprise, however we may love it, is an ally to Christianity or synonym for it? Can we know that the perpetuation of racial segregation even in so charitable a medium as a hospital, is "the Christian answer"? Can we at any time, confronted with the pressing issues of the hour, say, "This is *the* way, walk ye in it," and know we have spoken for God? Let us beware. Even the beloved disciple, carried away for the moment in his fervent devotion, was rebuked for presuming to call down fire in God's name upon a hostile community.

AMSTERDAM

While this editorial is being written delegates from the United States to the World Council of Churches are en route to Amsterdam. Before it goes to press these delegates will have gathered with men and women from 143 Christian Communions representing 43 nations to

affirm their deepest convictions of one Lord, one faith, and one baptism. And by the time it is being read the delegates will have left an Amsterdam whose very setting is symbolic of the cleavage between Soviet Russia and the Western Powers and where, as in Madras ten years ago, Christians alone, transcending all national and racial barriers, will have met in a darkening world to attest the unity of their faith, the universality of their gospel, and the brotherhood of all men under God.

"Christianity," writes Dr. Kenneth Scott Latourette in *The Christian Outlook,* "is more widely spread geographically, more deeply rooted among more peoples, and more influential in the total life of mankind than ever before. Moreover, in an age when mankind, if it would escape self-destruction, must learn to cooperate on a global scale, but when nations have been pulling apart, Christians have been coming together and are beginning to build a world-wide fellowship which transcends national and even warring lines." This in part is expressive of the spirit that informs and undergirds the World Council.

Christianity was not given us simply to hold the world together, but Christians realize that without it the world will fall apart. And they know that before they can bring the world its redeeming message of universal love and brotherhood they themselves must first draw nigh together in charity, humility, and unity. Yet here in the United States two of the strongest communions, the Roman Catholics and the Southern Baptists, largely for the same reason, have chosen to have nothing to do with Amsterdam, the former ignoring it completely and the latter refusing to authorize even an unofficial observer of its sessions.*

Time marches on, and while the divided body of Christ struggles for its spiritual re-union, two segments, each claiming on authority to be the New Testament Church, take the side lines of indifference and hostility.

* Note: The Vatican *is* sending "unofficial" observers to Amsterdam.

THE DILEMMA OF ORDINATION

There is an unexplored tract within our Southern Baptist ecclesiasticism. Perhaps it might better be called no-man's land, for it is really a terrain we dare not enter not because of its unknown wilderness, but because of its known dangers. And though we hold back and will not go in and possess it, yet we cannot put the remembrance of it out of our minds or keep it from plaguing our consciences. We know that our unwillingness to act has made it a scandal to our denomination, but we also know of the frightful consequences that await our action. It is the no-man's land of ordination to the ministry.

It is not the intent of this editorial to rush in where angels have feared to tread. The exuberance and self-confidence with which we have on other occasions expressed an opinion or stated a proposition is absent here, and our mood is rather one of caution and humility. We know what the score is, but we do not know the answers! The little Baptist Church in the mountains with six ordained ministers, each vying with the others for a pastorate — perhaps even for this church — is a sad but natural result of our wide-open practice of ordination. But there are denominations with rigid requirements and qualifications for their clergy which report today a serious shortage of ministers and are actually recruiting replacements elsewhere. Are they any better off? Again, we are frequently reminded that the majority of our ministers are not college bred and only a small percentage are seminary trained. Yet we observe that the communions with the uniformly educated clergy have somehow forfeited their appeal to the common people and restricted their ministry, with notable exceptions, to the intellectual and economic elite. Or, once more, the licensing and ordaining of untutored men, we are told, makes for theologically illiterate and often demogogic leadership among our people, and who can deny it? Yet Baptists know from the cruel pages of history, as perhaps no other Protestant sect can know, the sufferings and abuses that arise

from a self-contained and self-perpetuating clericalism.

All of this adds up to a dilemma. The good we would do we cannot do for fear of the evil that would come of our good intentions. And when we consider that any attempt to set up ordination boards to make requirements of qualifications of candidates and pass on them would be flagrant denial of the essence of our freedom. The paralysis of inaction is complete. Yet we must not and we shall not remain frustrated by the dilemma. Our heart and our flesh cry out in protest when we participate in the ordaining of a man with or perhaps without a high-school diploma in a day when the advantages of education are provided alike for city, hamlet, and rural areas and the standard of learning is everywhere being raised among our people. Nor in an age of biblical and theological illiteracy can we be content to send our pulpits men ill equipped to match this darkness with the light and life of the Word.

So we offer the pages of this journal to our readers as a forum for discussion of this matter. Having confessed our own inadequacy and bewilderment we invite the thinking of others in the belief that true wisdom will be found in the symposium. Especially do we urge the participation of our laymen, whose insight is of tremendous importance. We would like to publish correspondence on this topic in the next issue.

A CALL FOR CONVENTION REFORM

The convention at Memphis, deplored my many ministers and laymen, may prove a blessing in disguise in that it dramatized at least two weaknesses in our recent conventions: (1) the synonymity of messengers and non-messengers and (2) the unnecessarily large number of messengers. Hitherto *Christian Frontiers* has commented on the insincerity and inadequacy of the practice of sending "messengers" rather than delegates to our conventions, but just now we are concerned with the need for reform within the existing frame-work, and the Memphis Convention has made urgent that need in two areas.

Let us consider first the practical fusion of messengers and non-messengers. Since it is necessary under the present set-up for our convention to be held in large cities it is to be expected that a sizable part of the audiences will come as non-messengers (since each church is limited in its number of messengers) from the churches of the cities and their environs. It is inevitable that this element will reflect the mood and outlook of its area. And such was the case at Memphis. Hundreds of messengers left this convention feeling that something basically undemocratic had held sway from the first day. They needed no outsider to remind them that the shouting of Baptist democracy was in danger of becoming the tumult of mass psychology at the mercy of skilled platform clergymen. To say this is not to imply that the will of the majority was not accomplished at Memphis. The will of the majority prevailed there unmistakably. But it *is* to question the character, maneuverability and validity of that majority.

Upon the occasion of election of officers, for example, the outgoing president, albeit with grace and good-naturedly, found it necessary to caution the dangerously overcrowded assembly that only registered and fully accredited messengers could vote. To think that the caution was unnecessary is naive; to assume that it was strictly observed is charitable. But whatever may have been the outcome, the major error lay in permitting a situation where ballots may at any time possibly fall into hands of non-messengers. And there is the other consideration, entirely apart from the election, of applause, boos, and catcalls, which never fail to carry weight. If non-messengers wish to express their approval or disapproval after the manner of all conventions they should be granted this privilege. *But it should be known that it is they doing the applauding or booing.* In other words non-messengers should be seg-

regated, restricted to galleries and balconies, during the sessions, where they should be heartily welcomed, allowed mass self-expression, and denied the suffrage. Common sense, not to mention an elemental sense of fairness, dictates that such measures must be taken at once if democracy and orderliness are to be preserved at our conventions.

In the second place the matter of the number of messengers needs a thorough canvassing. Pastors have traditionally looked forward to the conventions as a combination of vacation with expenses paid and class re-union. For most of them the agenda has been important, of course, but not all-important. The main thing has been to forget not the annual assembling of themselves together. But with the growth and expansion of Southern Baptists the assembling together has taken on the proportions of a Passover pilgrimage of the diaspora. No Southern city can offer adequate hotel accommodations even if wives were left at home and W.M.U. ladies did not decide to stay over! It may look good as a "show of power" to announce that ten thousand messengers are in attendance, but ten thousand messengers, meeting in an auditorium built to accommodate five thousand people, and milling in and out in endless streams, offer a poor assurance of democracy in action. Under such conditions the wire-pulling, silent manipulation, and hotel-room strategy are inevitable, and open and extended debate is difficult.

Clearly the number of messengers must be limited. If a half thousand citizens can represent 140 million Americans in our National Legislature, surely two or three thousand messengers can look after the denominational interests of 6 or 7 million Baptists. One thousand would be better. The messengers might be chosen not by the churches on the old membership quota, but by the associations with each association rather than each church allotted at least one messenger, and so on. Each messenger would be strictly and solemnly charged by the association to attend all sessions, enter into debates, serve on committees and cast votes (roll call votes, too) and return to give an account of his stewardship, and so uphold the dignity and preserve the tradition of a responsible deliberative body. There are other and perhaps much better means of choosing the messengers, but some acceptable method must be settled on now.

But what about the rollicking annual demonstrations that have been passing for deliberative bodies? We need not, indeed we ought not, to dispose of them. Mass gatherings play an indispensable part in our religious life, and we should not leave all the pageantry to Roman Catholics. Let us then for the sheer spiritual exhilaration and moral re-inforcement they bring have the annual convention where all are welcomed and the middle wall of partition between messengers and non-messengers will never have the first brick laid. And in vast halls, or preferably stadia, let us hear the inspirational addresses, lift up our ten thousand times ten thousand voices in praise and in other ways demonstrate the numerical strength and spiritual vitality of our faith—and all this sans debate, sans committees, sans resolutions, and sans voting. And this is written not lightly but in dead seriousness, for God does come in pentecostal power to such throngs.

WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE

ROBERT C. RAY, an industrialist, is a member of the First Baptist Church, Franklin, Virginia.

ADIEL J. MONCRIEF, Pastor, the First Baptist Church, St. Joseph, Missouri, was formerly a distinguished Canadian Baptist, Pastor, Walmer Road Baptist Church, Toronto.

W. R. CULLOM, Professor Emeritus at Wake Forest College, was formerly Head of the Department of Religion there.

ROBERT H. AYERS is the Baptist State Student Secretary of South Carolina.

A Layman Attends His First Convention

By Robert C. Ray

When I was asked to write an article on the layman's impression of the Memphis meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention, I felt that I must immediately modify the title to read *one* layman's impression of the Memphis Convention—his first convention.

Quite naturally I went to my first convention with a few qualms. My religion is a thing that I hesitate to have discussed by several thousand fellow Baptists, even if it is their own opinions that they are expressing and I do not have to agree. I was particularly glad I did not have to agree after hearing the Convention speak its mind on several controversial matters.

The Memphis Convention impressed me as a tremendously large and unwieldy thing that could get completely out of hand quite easily unless skillfully and competently led. And Dr. Newton did just that. But even his skillful handling could not keep the Convention from taking several steps that I think unwise.

The turning down of Dr. Sadler as an observer at the World Council of Churches meeting this summer was, I think, most unwise. This is certainly no time for us to turn our backs on any possible chance of world peace, and I think that the World Council certainly offers a good try at it. I can't understand the isolationist viewpoint expressed by many at the Convention. Jesus said, "For he that is not against us is for us," and following this line of thought I do not think that we should take a definite stand against the World Council.

I also think that the admittance of Kansas into the Southern Convention was not proper. After hearing as much of the argument as possible, I think that the practice is bad of taking states from the Northern Convention and adding them to the Southern Convention, for it is much too large anyway.

The size of the convention should be controlled more carefully. With the convention growing as it is, it is my opinion that only certified messengers should be allowed in the Convention Hall. It is too easy for a large number of visitors to sway the opinion of the Convention by clapping or otherwise manifesting their opinion. I think that admission to the Convention Hall should be by Messenger Badge only.

But enough of these few bad things and on to the more favorable impressions. The singing was glorious. I had been told that the singing was one of the outstanding thrills of the convention, and it surpassed even my expectations. When the Brothers and Sisters really opened up on some of the old hymns it brought tears to the eyes and joy to the heart.

The Foreign Missions Night was, I think, the most inspiring part of the Convention. I wish that every Southern Baptist could have heard those people who have dedicated their lives to carrying the gospel to all the world. Then at the end of the service, when all those who wanted to dedicate their lives to such an undertaking were asked to come to the front of the auditorium, and over a hundred went forward, I saw that their story had not been told in vain.

Dr. C. Oscar Johnson's magnificent plea for unification of all the Baptists made a fitting close to my last session of the Convention. We are truly fortunate in having such a great man as one of us, and his message was one of the keynotes of the Convention to me. What a great band we Baptists are, a multitude enlisted in the work of God. What a wonderful work we can do, united in spirit and aim.

Ecumenicity and Southern Baptists

By Adiel J. Moncrief

Dr. Robert A. Ashworth, writing on the position of Baptists with reference to the general movement which is seeking the union of Protestant Christendom, expressed the view of most American Baptists, I believe, when he declared: "If by 'unity' is meant mutual sympathy and respect and co-operation among Christian bodies in all common Christian enterprises, it may be confidently asserted, judging by their repeated expressions, that Baptist churches throughout the world would earnestly desire it. If by 'unity' is meant, however, organic church union, involving an hierarchical form of church government, and common creedal symbols conceived to be authoritative over the individual conscience, I doubt whether the Baptist churches will ever desire it or can ever accept the idea that it has much justification."*

It is a deep-seated fear of the latter thing that has prompted the Southern Baptist Convention to decline by decisive votes to affiliate with either the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, or the World Council of Churches now in process of formation. The position of Southern Baptists is growing more difficult every year because the world-wide trend toward ecumenicity is against them. A great host of Christian leaders, including such figures as the Archbishop of Canterbury, the President of the British Free Church Council and the Presidents of the American and Canadian Councils of Churches, have on many occasions declared it to be their conviction that the present movement toward unity is born of the Holy Spirit and is a fulfillment of the mind of God for this generation of Christians. They insist that at long last the prayer of Jesus that His scattered flock might be made one, even as He and the Heavenly Father are One, is being answered by the vision and practical efforts of men in promoting ecumenicity.

This viewpoint is not convincing to many Southern Baptists. They are not talking about the ecumenical movement. The rank and file of their preachers, as they express themselves in conventions and in their press, are not inclined to talk about it. They do not deal with ultimate issues in the great question of a divided Christendom. They are preoccupied with matters that have the denomination as the frame of reference. With Southern Baptists, the size and extent of the denominational interest and activities is great enough to save these labors from the judgment of smallness, even though they cannot escape the stigma of sectarianism. This numerical strength and localized influence of Southern Baptists, however, has long troubled some of the more thoughtful preachers of the South who feel that the scope of the Christian evangel and its creative action, as far as Baptists are concerned, is constantly suffering as a consequence of this condition.

The British Baptists have taken a different course from that of Southern Baptists. They have joined the Church Council of Great Britain and have assumed full responsibilities with other Protestant and Evangelical churches in the British Isles in maintaining a cooperative organization of the churches. The experience does not seem to have brought any harm to our British brethren. They have not grown and prospered materially as have Southern Baptists, but the reasons for this lie elsewhere. They have a democratic spirit and a local independence that is more pronounced than that found in the average Southern congregation.

The late Dr. J. H. Rushbrooke, who was a lover of things pertaining to Baptists everywhere, told me in Toronto several years ago, that in his

* *Union of Christendom*, Edited by Kenneth Mackenzie, Bishop of Brechin. The Macmillan Company, p. 527.

opinion Baptists ought to join the church councils wherever they had an invitation to do so, because doing so affords them the opportunity to bear their witness against the forms of ecclesiasticism which always hinder the free course of the gospel. He said that he warmly consented to the idea of church councils and their free and cooperative functions, but that he was opposed to any overall, organic union that would deprive the churches of their freedom.

In Canada, where the Baptists are not numerous, but where because of the high type of personalities within their fellowship they exercise an influence out of all proportion to their strength, the President of the Canadian Council of Churches is a distinguished Baptist — Dr. George Peel Gilmour, Chancellor of McMaster University of Ontario. (During my ministry at Walmer Road Church, Toronto, I was a member of the Baptist delegation on the national council and observed the most cordial and fruitful relations of our Canadian Baptist friends and their fellow Christians of other denominational families).

It is well-known that the Northern Baptist Convention has long been active in the Federal Council of Churches and has given several honored Presidents to that organization through the years. Efforts to disrupt this fruitful relationship between the Northern churches and the council have been defeated by strong leaders because the record of the achievements of the council commends itself to the rank and file of Northern Baptists.

What about Southern Baptists and the coming events at Amsterdam? When the American Committee for the World Council of Churches gathers in the Constituting Assembly in the war-shaken city of Holland there will be some Southern Baptists present, and there will be some "unofficial observers," but there will be no duly elected representatives of the largest division of the "largest free church body on earth." North American Christian denominations and communions will be represented by 90 official delegates representing 32 communions. These will sit in the general assembly with alternates and other accredited visitors under the present plan of world council organization. This is to be a historic occasion when the Christian fellowship around the world will once more draw together in brotherly love and write another chapter in the Acts of the Apostles.

At Amsterdam the churches will face, under realistic and scholarly leadership, the awful paganism of today's world. They will deal with questions of vital concern to the very existence of Christian civilization in lands that have become almost wholly pagan and secular. They will endeavor through the gospel to advance the solidarity and spiritual awakening of the nations constituting the free world. They will seek to bring world reconstruction under more spiritual and moral auspices. These forces for rehabilitation are now almost secularized.

Southern Baptists, with six million members in American churches great and small, should not be aloof from this great endeavor of moral reconstruction. Baptists cannot escape responsibility by saying they lack an organized life in which is vested "ecclesiological authority," because they do function as a Christian body. In many parts of the world Baptists are thought of as an obscure and rather ignorant sect. They are judged by small and underprivileged groups. These false impressions cannot be corrected by the present trend to avoid all forums of interchurch witness and discussion where opportunity might be had to set the true Baptist position and the real Baptist people before the rest of the Christian world in advantageous light.

"New occasions teach new duties," and it would appear that in the fullness of time there are great stirrings abroad with spiritual possibilities that Baptists would do well to face with serious and resolute purpose.

My Manifesto

By W. R. Cullom

When the request came to me two or three weeks ago from the editor of *Christian Frontiers* that I should write the present statement, it was not clear to me whether I was asked to speak as a personal Christian or as a minister of Christ. An inquiry brought the suggestion that I speak in both capacities.

Sixty-Seven Years A Christian: On September 1, 1881, I was baptized in a little stream in Halifax County, North Carolina. The little creek in which I was baptized was called Quankie. The little country church close by which bears the name of the stream was organized on the day that I joined it, my older sister and I being among the twelve constituent members. Until a year or so before this date there had been no Baptist preaching in our community. Sometime during 1880 a little man physically whose name was A. G. Wilcox began to preach in a log school-house on my father's farm. This man was often in my father's home and soon came to be loved as a warm friend and the beloved shepherd of our household. In the summer of 1881 the neighbors built a "bush arbor" a few hundred yards from the school-house, to accommodate more people. Dr. J. D. Hufham of Scotlend Neck came up to help Mr. Wilcox in evangelistic services. Dr. Hufham was a very eloquent preacher, and large crowds came to hear him. When he had been with us a day or two, Dr. Hufham made this statement: "Great faith is spoken of only twice in the New Testament. Little faith is spoken of over and over again. It is not the quantity of one's faith that saves; it is the one in whom the faith is centered that matters. If there be one here who has little faith, but that faith is centered in Jesus Christ as a personal Saviour, I want him to come and give me his hand as a token of that fact." I came on that invitation, joined the group in organizing the church at the close of the meeting, and have gone on from that day to this in a more or less halting way as a professed Christian. Two people in the New Testament seem to me to characterize my attitude as a Christian better than any others: (1) the publican who stood afar off smiting on his breast and saying "God, be merciful to me the sinner"; (2) the man who when asked whether he believed said, "Lord, I believe, help thou mine unbelief."

On last November at the request of the diaconate of our church here at Wake Forest, it was my privilege to administer the Lord's Supper for our congregation made up of students, faculty, and community people. In approaching this celebration I took occasion to remark on what I have always felt in approaching the supper, *viz.* this: "Whenever I come to approach this table and think of what it symbolizes I feel that I should turn my back and face the other way. Then another thought comes to me and I ask myself this question: 'If I turn from this and especially from the great fact symbolized by this where shall I go?' This question always drives me back saying as I come,

> In my hand no price I bring,
> Simply to thy cross I cling;
> Naked, come to thee for dress;
> Helpless, look to thee for grace;
> Vile, I to the fountain fly,
> Wash me, Saviour, or I die."

Of course Christ means much more to me now than he did in the beginning of my life as a Christian. He is to me the One in whom all things "hold together"; he is the pioneer leading to all that is most worth while; he is the Word made flesh so that in fellowship with Him we may come into present and direct fellowship with God; he is the Alpha and the Omega of all creation; he is in the eternal counsels of God, King of Kings and Lord of Lords.

In fellowship with him we can say, "Now are we the Sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall 'see him as he is'."

So then as I look to the past I can sing with the penitent John Newton,

Tis grace that brought me safe thus far,
And grace will lead me home.

As I look at the present I can say with the Apostle Paul, "By the grace of God I am what I am" (I Cor.; 15:10).

As I look to the future and face all that is ahead, I can sing with Edward Mote,

My hope is built on nothing less
Than Jesus' blood and righteousness;
I dare not trust the sweetest frame
But wholly lean on Jesus' name.

I can also sing with Mr. Hopper,

Jesus, Saviour, pilot me
Over life's tempestuous sea;
Unknown waves before me roll,
Hiding rock and treacherous shoal;
Chart and compass come from thee;
Jesus, Saviour, pilot me.

Sixty Years a Minister of the Gospel:

In the same little church that was organized on September 1, 1881, I was set apart to the gospel ministry on the fourth Sunday in May, 1888. Dr. T. J. Taylor of Warrenton preached the ordination sermon. His text was: "Make full proof of thy ministry" (2 Tim. 4:5). Pastor Wilcox made the charge and offered the ordaining prayer.

Like most of the experiences that have come to me, there was nothing startling in my call to the ministry. The particular decision to be a preacher came about in this way: I was clerking in a little country store in Warren county. This store was in sight of Brown's Baptist Church and was run by Mr. Joseph L. Rodwell. My bedroom was in the store, and my meals were taken at the table of Mr. Rodwell's brother-in-law, Mr. Walter Allen. My work and my fellowship were very agreeable to me, but there was a stirring in my soul for something further. In 1885 a friend of mine was teaching in Davie County near Farmington. He knew that I wanted to go to school but could see no way to do so. In this situation a letter came to me from this friend proposing that I come up to Davie and room with him and help him with his teaching, and he would teach me. I had never been to a high school! At the close of the school year in the spring of 1886 my friend declined re-election for the position he held, and the trustees elected me to succeed him! In the meantime, I came back to Brown's Church in Warren County and taught a little public school in the summer of 1886. My room was the same that I used when clerking in the store and my boarding place the same. In my room in this little store house I sat down one night and wrote pastor Wilcox telling him of my feelings as to the ministry. When I heard from him he had asked the church at Quankie to license me to preach. He began at once to arrange for me to enter Wake Forest College. The people in Davie County were informed of what was going on. They rejoiced at the news and released me from my contract with them, and on September 1, 1886, I put my foot upon the Wake Forest campus for the first time.

In the mean time, just before leaving the Brown's community, Dr. T. J. Taylor of Warrenton invited me to come over to his prayer meeting service in Warrenton and preach for him. I was innocent enough to go over and try it! This was the last Thursday night in August, 1886. My text was taken from Matthew 11:29 and had in it three words: "Learn of me." A good layman friend of mine never misses an opportunity to urge ministers to preach Jesus Christ and leave off all side issues. It has been my purpose during these sixty years to try honestly to do two things: (1) obey the injunction of my first text; (2) hold my messages constantly and faithfully to this central theme. If I were going to start over these sixty years today I should underscore these two purposes.

About twenty years ago or a little more the young ministers at Wake Forest requested me to speak to them on the matter of a Baptist minister in

a given community in his relationship to his fellow ministers of other denominations. The three things that I said to those young men gathered in Wingate Memorial Hall on that day seem to me now to be thoroughly safe, sensible, sound and wise as guiding principles in just about all of a minister's relationships. These were my suggestions on that occasion: (1) be a gentleman; (2) be a Christian; (3) be a Baptist. And I urged those young men to take and follow my suggestions in the order named. Let us look at them a little further:

Who has not seen ministers in their zeal for their own "side" appear to forget the more delicate instincts, not to say habits of the gentleman? It makes no difference what the circumstances or even what the provocation may be, no minister of Christ can afford to stoop to that which is not essentially the conduct of a gentleman in his attitude toward and his dealings with his fellows. Are these matters clean? Are they carried on with due consideration for the other man's good name? For his success? For his influence among his own people and among the people of the community? Do we carry a spirit of good will towards our fellows? These questions offer a hint as to my conception of a gentleman.

And then one wants to be Christian. Much of what has been suggested as to the gentleman could not be carried on and practised without involving much that is Christian. And yet, to use a phrase that came to me from my friend, Dr. Frank Leavel, there is a "Christian plus." What is it? The key word in Christian nomenclature as I see it is the word *love*. The great Augustine of Hippo was not far wrong, surely, when he said, "Love God and do what you please." When our Lord was asked as to which is the great commandment — the *summum bonum* of it all — he named love to God and love to one's fellows as the two great foci of spirit, of attitude, of life in his Kingdom. There are no blue prints given. The fact that a man is born of God and is honestly trying to learn of Jesus should carry a minister, and other people too, progressively and increasingly into the Christian way. If I were called upon to describe the Christian way of life in New Testament language, I should say it is losing life to save it. Or, to put it in different language, it is to forget self in the interest of others.

And then he should be a Baptist, or whatever he pretends to be, and be loyal and faithful to his own faith and to his own group. Many delicate questions arise here: Who is to define terms for him—his local church or some more general body? Who is to measure and approve or disapprove at this point? The Baptist thesis, as I understand it, involves an absolute renunciation of self—being "buried with Christ"—and the acceptance of Another as one's supreme Lord, Guide, Director and Leader. Is there coming to be among Baptists too much tendency to lay down what I have called "blue prints"? The suggestions that I am here hinting go deep and far. Nothing short of the "birth from above" and a constant perpetual and honest renewal of the question that turned Saul the persecutor into Paul the humble Christian will do for Baptists: "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?"

A faithful application of these three principles will constitute a safe guide for the minister of Christ—young minister, middle-aged minister, old minister; a minister in a large and influential church and a minister in the humblest place in all the world; the "mind that was in Christ Jesus" (Phil. 2:5-8) will always and everywhere be a safe guide for his servant. And one who follows this principle may do so in the assurance that in the end the Master will say to him, "Where I am there shall also my servant be."

These are some of the ideals and purposes that have been in my soul through these sixty years as a minister of Christ.

In closing my personal word above I referred to two or three hymns that I could sing in all honesty and sincerity. If I may quote a hymn in closing my

word as a minister it will be that pertinent word from Mr. Samuel Medley:

O could I speak the matchless worth
O could I sound the glories forth which
in my Saviour shine!
I'd soar, and touch the heavenly strings
And vie with Gabriel while he sings
in notes almost divine.

I'd sing the precious blood he spilt
My ransom from the dreadful guilt
of sin and wrath divine!
I'd sing his glorious righteousness
In which all-perfect dress my soul
shall ever shine.

I'd sing the character he bears
And all the forms of love He wears
exalted on His throne:
In loftiest songs of sweetest praise I
would to everlasting days
Make all His glories known.

The Problem of Relationship In The Counseling Process

By Robert H. Ayers

An important factor in counseling is the establishment of a proper relationship between counselor and counselee. If the relationship is strained, if the consultant feels uncomfortable, because the counseling is made a mysterious experience or he senses coldness in the counselor, there can be no real counseling. The counselor must have genuine interest in and good will for the consultant. A contemporary statement concerning John Dod, a Puritan minister of the early seventeenth century, illustrates the attitude every minister and counselor should take toward one coming to him for help:

> Moreover, he made it easy for them to seek him out for private conferences in their difficulties. His habit was to use the church edifice for his study. There perplexed souls would find him, and if he thought them bashful, he would meet them and say, "Would you speak with me?" And when he found them unable to state their question, he would help them out with it, taking care to find the sore: But would answer and deal so compassionately and tenderly as not to discourage the poorest soul from coming again to him.

Here is perhaps the greatest element in the establishment of a good relationship—a warm affection for people, without criticisms or moral judgments. Here is that fellowship with God and sympathy with man that makes for good counseling.

Problems are not solved by words and lectures. No amount of sermonizing can solve a person's problem when he is unaware of its emotional roots. Nor can it be solved through an intellectual understanding of its causes, unless he is able to come to grips with these causes and work out an emotional adjustment.

Moralizing has no curative effect in counseling. The curative element arises from the effect of one personality upon another. Since our emotional problems arise out of unhealthy personal relationships, they can only be solved through healthy personal relationships. Therapy is 95 per cent personality and 5 per cent technique. Therefore, the counselor needs to develop a healthy mindedness and strength of character. It is imperative that he understand himself so that he can work out his own anxieties, fears, and guilt and have them under control. Socrates' dictum

"know thyself" is applicable to the counselor.

Anxieties on the part of the counselor can kill the counseling process. They cause the counselor to reject the counselee and his problem, to show lack of interest in what the counselee is saying at the moment, to show hostility to the counselee, or unjustly to take the counselee's side against someone else. Any one of these reactions will block the counseling process.

Bonnell, in *Psychology For Pastor and People,* suggests that the skillful counselor establish an empathic relationship with the consultant. The word *empathy* he believes to be superior to the word *sympathy* in describing the proper relationship. This word comes from the Greek word *empatheria,* meaning "to feel into." It means that the counselor enters successfully into the emotional experiences of another. As Adler says in *Understanding Human Nature,* "Empathy occurs in the moment one human being speaks to another. It is impossible to understand another individual if it is impossible at the same time to identify one's self with him."

Empathy implies such a "feeling into," such complete identity, that one feels emotions and reactions in the same manner that another feels them. Yet the counselor must, at the same time that he feels empathy with another, hold himself to some extent aloof. Complete identity ruins the counseling process. The story is told of a counselor in a camp crying with a girl who had come to her with a distressing problem. Naturally this only added to the emotional tension of the girl instead of helping her to solve the problem. The counselor must be sensitive enough to the needs of the counselee to control his own identification with the counselee in order to serve best the person he is helping. He must, for example, regard objectively the love and hate of the consultants toward himself.

In this regard, Bonnell's *Psychology for Pastor and People* gives the following advice concerning the problem of "transference."

It is unwise for the Pastor-counselor to practice the Freudian technique of transference, whereby he receives to himself the affection of a consultant, retaining it until the appropriate stage of the counseling process, when he redirects it to its natural objective. Rapport must be established with each consultant, and a measure of affection will be given to the Pastor-counselor, but he will unfailingly direct it toward God.

In some respects this is good advice; in other respects, it is bad. Certainly, no pastor is capable of going into the long process of psychoanalysis where the Freudian type of transference is a sought-for goal. He doesn't have the time, nor the ability to do so. Yet, to advise the counselor when transference does arise to redirect it toward God is to give a general bit of advice that leaves one up in the air with no means of working its fulfillment.

In the book *Psychoanalytic Therapy* by Alexander, French, and others, transference has been defined in this manner. "In its widest sense, transference is the neurotic repetition with relation to the analyst of a stereotyped, unsuitable behavior pattern based on the patient's past." It is entirely possible, then, that the counselee will direct not only feelings of affection to the counselor, but also feelings of resentment, guilt and fear. These are not suitable emotions to be directed toward God. Often the counselee will have already one or more of these feelings projected toward God. This will especially be true if he has had unfortunate experiences with a domineering father. The problem, then, in many cases is that of helping the counselee to be relieved altogether of these unhealthy feelings.

The study of the problem of transference has led this writer to a reversal of opinion concerning the method of counseling. Through inexperience and acquaintance with only one method, the writer has taken the directive approach. However, this method leads into some serious difficulties. It takes away the freedom and the responsibility of the

counselee and leaves him dependent entirely upon the direction of the counselor. A problem-centered approach is taken by the counselor. He seeks to solve problems rather than to help persons grow. He fails to recognize that a growing person can solve his own problems, and that solving his own problems helps a person grow. This approach also involves the counselor in probing and digging, somewhat like the psychoanalyst, in an attempt to get at the counselee's real source of difficulty. This brings about in the counselee not only a sense of dependence but also a feeling of resentment. The result is that the counselee wishes to please the counselor and yet dislikes him. He wishes to lean on the counselor and yet wants to be free at the same time.

K. Horney's *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time* says:

> In relationships in which one person becomes dependent on another, there is invariably a good deal of resentment. The dependent person resents being enslaved; he resents having to comply, but continues to do so for fear of losing the other. Not knowing that it is his anxiety which creates the situation, he will easily assume that his subjugation has been brought about by the other's imposing on him. Resentment growing on such a basis has to be repressed, because the affection of the other is bitterly needed, and this repression in turn generates new anxiety, with a subsequent need for reassurance and hence a reinforced impulse to cling to the other.

This is what happens when the counselor gives "spiritual prescriptions" or other advice. Resentment is also brought about by the unwise use of prayer and by the questioning method.

It is recognized even by psychoanalysts today that the transference neurosis is not inevitable and that it must be controlled. It was once thought that improvement in the life of the counselee could only be achieved by transferring his neurotic fixations to the counselor, of which neurotic condition the counselee must then be cured. The transference neurosis was then used to reveal unconscious material, to make interpretation, and to assist the counselee in working through his problem. It has been discovered now, however, that this technique is dangerous because the transference neurosis can be used as a covering for a feeling of hostility to the counselor and as a means of resistance to insight. If it becomes a total retreat from life, the cure is as bad as the disease, if not worse.

Weiss, in *Psychoanalytic Therapy*, has shown that transference is not always possible since the counselor may not be suitable for a particular counselee's emotions. The counselor may not symbolize that person in this particular counselee's past about whom his emotional disturbance is centered. Or, on the contrary, rapport may be impossible with a particular counselee if the counselor resembles too closely a person in the counselee's past about whom he has strong feelings of hate, fear, or guilt. If this initial disadvantage can be overcome by wise responses on the part of the counselor, a more thorough type of therapy may be achieved. If not, then it would seem wise to refer the counselee to another counselor.

Therapists are generally agreed, then, that in cases where transference is apt to take place, steps should be taken to control it.

The standard technique to control transference seems, however, to create other unfavorable reactions. It has been the general practice of analysts to try to keep their own personalities entirely out of the picture. They try to create a controlled laboratory situation where their own individual peculiarities play the least possible part in stimulating client reaction. In the interview the counselee is made to lie on a couch with the analyst behind him so that not even the facial expressions of the analyst are observable by the counselee. The result of such a practice is to create an air of unreality, mystery, and coldness in the whole process.

If, then, the counselor is to take a

normal, warm and affectionate attitude, how is he to control the transference neurosis? The answer is in the non-directive approach plus the establishment of well defined limits in the counseling situation.

The fact that in the non-directive approach the counselee is given the freedom to carry the conversation as he pleases, gives to the counselee a responsibility for the whole process which keeps at a minimum his sense of dependence on the counselor. This reveals to him that the counselor respects his personality and feels that he is of some worth. That the counselor does not give him advice bolsters his sense of independence.

To be sure, even in non-directive counseling many counselees feel dependent on the counselor. However, if he accepts this right of the counselee without anxiety or egoism, or the domination of the counselee's decisions, he can by skillful responses lead the client to that insight which helps him grow away from dependence to independence. In this respect, the counseling relationship is somewhat akin to that of the wise parent with his children. The wise parent realizes that his children achieve maturity only as they grow away from him. Therefore, he gives them opportunity gradually to accept responsibilities and to make their own decisions.

Moreover, transference is kept at a minimum in the non-directive interview if certain limits are established. One of these limits has already been mentioned, that the counselor must refuse to take responsibility for the problems and actions of the counselee. He will not do for the client what the client ought to do for himself. Another limitation is that concerning time. The counselee is free to break his appointment or to keep it, to come on time or late, to use the time in idle talk or to get at his real problem. But he should not be free to control the counselor and to gain more time through using tricks. Often the counselee will wait until the last minute to bring up some important item, seeking in this way to gain more time. The counselor must be kind but firm and terminate the interview within a reasonable approximation of the limit set. If he does not do so, the transference problem will be one of domination of the counselor by counselee.

There must also be a limit to physical destructiveness. While the counselee is free to express his hostilities as strongly as he wishes, he is not free to attack the counselor or destroy property. In therapy with children they are permitted to smash such items as clay dolls, shout, or spill water. But this is limited to the therapist's office.

Again, there is a limitation to the number of appointments. It seems best to space them a week apart, for often in the interval the counselee gains valuable insights as he works on the problem in his natural environment. This limitation also lessens the attachment which the counselee is apt to develop for the counselor.

This whole matter of proper limitations has other therapeutic value. Limitations are to be found on all sides in actual life. Part of the process of growing to maturity is the accepting of limitations and the making of proper adjustments to them.

In conclusion, Roger's *Counseling and Psychotherapy* summarizes the problem of relationship:

> The counseling relationship is one in which warmth of acceptance and absence of any coercion or personal pressure on the part of the counselor permits the maximum expression of feelings, attitudes, and problems by the counselee. The relationship is a well-structured one, with limits of time, of dependence, and of aggressive action which apply particularly to the client, and limits of responsibility and of affection which the counselor imposes upon himself. In this unique experience of complete emotional freedom within a well-defined framework, the client is able to recognize and understand his impulses and patterns, positive and negative, as in no other relationship.

CHRISTIAN FRONTIERS

JANUARY, 1949

In This Issue:

CRITICISM AND THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE BIBLE ..... E. F. Scott

THE TEST OF POETRY ..... Sara Lowrey

WHY SOME GOOD BAPTISTS ARE ANTI-MISSIONARY ..... John T. Wayland

THE TRAGEDY OF MISPLACED EMPHASIS ..... S. L. Morgan, Sr.

COMMUNISM: WHAT IT IS AND WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT ..... Kelley Barnett

Publication of the Baptist Book Club, Incorporated

CHRISTIAN FRONTIERS

A Journal of Baptist Life and Thought

Vol. II JANUARY, 1949 No. 1

EDITORIAL BOARD

WILLIAM W. FINLATOR, *Editor-in-Chief*
MARJORIE E. MOORE, *Advisory Editor*
J. O. BAILEY, *Managing Editor*
ALMONTE C. HOWELL, *Book Editor*
SARA LOWREY, *Poetry Editor*

SOUTHWIDE ADVISORY COUNCIL

W. O. CARVER, LOUISVILLE, KY.
H. B. CROSS, NASHVILLE, TENN.
GEORGE B. CUTTEN, CHAPEL HILL, N. C.
J. M. DAWSON, WASHINGTON, D. C.
CLYDE V. HICKERSON, RICHMOND, VA.
EDWARD H. PRUDEN, WASHINGTON, D. C.
J. C. WILKINSON, ATHENS, GA.
SWAN HAYWORTH, VICKSBURG, MISS.
WITHROW T. HOLLAND, HAYNESVILLE, LA.
ADIEL J. MONCRIEF, ST. JOSEPH, MO.
BLAKE SMITH, AUSTIN, TEXAS
HUBERT R. HOWARD, JR., TULSA, OKLA.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

LEE C. SHEPPARD, *Chairman*
FRED B. HELMS
CARL LEE OUSLEY
R. K. REDWINE
JOHN MCGINNIS
A. C. MCCALL

CONTENTS

Editorials 28
A Prayer of Thanksgiving ..... Lanneau D. Lide 28
Criticism And The Understanding of the Bible ..... E. F. Scott 28
The Test of Poetry ..... Sara Lowrey 29
Poems ..... Mary White Slater, Mabel Pyland Cooper 29
Why Some Good Baptists Are Anti-Missionary ..... John T. Wayland 29
The Tragedy of Misplaced Emphasis ..... S. L. Morgan, Sr. 29
Communism: What It Is and What To Do About It ..... Kelley Barnett 30
Who's Who in This Issue 30
Correspondence 30

Christian Frontiers is published monthly (except July and August) by the Baptist Book Club, a non-profit fellowship of ministers and laymen. Address all correspondence to Box 508, Chapel Hill, North Carolina. *Copyright 1946 by the Baptist Book Club.* *Entered as second class matter February 6, 1947 at the post office at Chapel Hill, N. C. under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription price, two dollars a year; twenty-five cents a copy. Printed by The Graphic Press, Inc., Raleigh, North Carolina.*

EDITORIALS

HIC JACET

With this issue **Christian Frontiers** folds up. This decision, made in the teeth of assurances of its continuance, was forced upon us for a number of reasons. Perhaps the chief and most obvious reason is lack of money. Having no institutional backing, and indeed desiring none, **Christian Frontiers** was always at the mercy of private contribution and support. While friends have been generous and, in one or two instances, liberal, the lack of organized effort has made impossible the "guaranteed income" upon which the survival of such a journal depends. With the moving from North Carolina of several key men in our venture whose work had placed them in coigns of vantage our organization disintegrated. This loss did not occasion our "time of troubles" but undoubtedly gave it the "death blow."

We cease and desist with neither illusion nor blame. We feel that short-lived as was our venture we served a real purpose and do not need to console ourselves with the cold comfort that ours was a "noble experiment." We are conscious of both our virtues and our faults. Were we given a new lease on life our original purpose would remain unreconstructed, but a number of our methods and approaches would bear scrutiny and possible change.

To all who have been associated with us, supported us, rebuked us in charity, followed us in faith, prayed for us in hope we are unpayably grateful. We shall remember you from the land of Jordan and of the Hermonites.

And now let us begin and carry up this corpse, singing together, looking for the resurrection of a nobler and a finer successor!

"ETERNAL VIGILANCE . . . . "

The secular press has made much ado over an incident in North Carolina Baptist life about which Baptists themselves have been officially quiet. Rev. K. M. Lindner, an exchaplain, after stating publicly his opinion that government control of alcoholic beverages was preferable to and more effective than prohibition, was peremptorily removed as president of the South River Association Ministers Conference. Immediately following this action by his fellow ministers, Mr. Lindner called his church in conference and announced that his resignation as pastor was available if the church willed it. Several days afterwards the church gave the minister a vote of confidence, and to date he remains pastor.

This incident must not be ignored. Here is bigotry masquerading as zeal; here is intolerance confused with conviction. Mr. Lindner was removed from office not because of any personal unfitness—he is a total abstainer and deplores the use of alcohol — but because he differed with them as to the best method of controlling the consumption of alcoholic beverages. His experience and observation had led him to an honest acceptance of a method politically hot and ecclesiastically unorthodox, and for this he had to step down as head of the sanhedrin. We all hate demon rum and wish devoutly we might remove this dreadful evil, but when one of our number is shown the exit for questioning the standardized solution, we have mistaken zeal for intolerance.

But there are overtones to this incident which bring a foreboding of something more. Can it be but one piece out of a broad pattern of standardization? Can it be a natural

expression of a denomination of once free people who have crystallized into a deadening conformity? Can it be part and parcel of a growing trend toward uniformity in all things? These questions may be put too strongly, but through their exaggeration some of us can sense disturbingly an impatience with dissent of any kind. We Baptists have long boasted of our traditional freedom, the competence of every individual before God, the open Bible and the open heart, but through the years we have been slipping into a theological and ecclesiastical conformity that rivals in spirit the papacy. And from theological and ecclesiastical conformity it is but one step to conformity in method. One trembles to write these words and does so with hesitancy and diffidence, but one must speak lest the secular world wonder if we have renounced our vaunted freedom and Baptists, remaining silent, forfeit their dearest heritage.

The removal of Mr. Lindner is no isolated incident. It is a body blow at the heart of Baptist freedom.

CAN CATHOLICISM WIN THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION?

In the September issue **Home Missions** carried an interesting article entitled, "Roman Catholic or Southern Baptist?" in which a Baptist, converted from the Roman Catholic faith, describes his efforts to win over a Jesuit priest. There are many cases, unheralded in the secular press which apparently regards only one way conversions from protestantism as newsworthy, in which Roman Catholics, some prominent, become Baptists. We think, however, that the time has come for some Baptist, deeply loyal to his faith and denomination, and enjoying the respect of his brethren, to write a treatise on the inroads of Catholicism into our Southern Baptist life and thought. With appropriate apologies to Harold Fey he might entitle the treatise, "Can Catholicism Win the S. B. C.?" If any of our readers wishes to undertake this venture we shall remind him now that it calls for courage, humility, and scholarship. And in addition, we offer gratis the following suggestions:

The writer might make it clear at the outset that the Roman Church does not now and will not in the foreseeable future gain many converts from the Southern Baptist Convention. Baptists and Jehovah's Witnesses will be about the last ever to return to the "Mother Church." But he will be troubled by unmistakable trends, of which the Lindner incident is a case in point, which are leading our denomination not to Rome but to Romanism. And he will observe the parallel between democratic nations which become fascist in their war on fascist nations, and freedom-loving non-Catholic groups becoming slowly catholicized while vehemently opposing the inroads of the Roman Catholic Church.

He will be concerned over the growing power of organization in our Convention. Baptists have traditionally attacked the hierarchy without mercy and with good reason as the greatest system of self-perpetuated tyranny in human history. Yet there is much in the machinery of our Convention, its demand for conformity and its reluctance to change, its subtle power to reward the conformist or make uncomfortable the non-conformist, that more than suggests the hierarchy, especially if we admit the possibility of a little group of wilful, if consecrated men, controlling this organization.

Furthermore our writer will observe how we have appropriated the spirit of Romanism with respect to authority. While vigorously rejecting the claim of the papacy to have received its authority from

Christ via Peter, the first Pope, we have claimed to be exact replicas of a New Testament Church—though scholars have discovered several New Testament Churches with organizational differences — and we have substituted an infallible Bible for an infallible Pope. The "Mother Church," "The New Testament Church," papacy, and biblicism — these come perilously close to creating the self-same spirit. And while we Baptists cannot boast the roster of saints the Roman Church has produced to bolster this authority, still the heavy hand of the past is upon us and the voices of many honored dead yet speak in our pulpits and publications.

To write all this will not be easy. We would not tolerate it from an outsider and we shall probably make it hard on one of the family. Yet some competent, courageous soul must undertake this inside job of reminding us now that not only **can** catholicism win the Southern Baptist Convention, but is actually doing it.

EX LIBRIS

The library of the average pastor exhibits mal-nutrition. From a literary point of view it is "slim pickings"; from a theological, it is a surfeit of homiletical starches and **ersatz** theology, and indeed a little short of scandal. Dignified with the name "study" the library represents the minister's most neglected opportunity. The visit of a cultured layman embarrasses us while we sputter for excuses and mumble our regrets that the press of pastoral cares and civic duties keeps us so much away.

And what does this layman find in our "studies"? Here and there are some old text books kept from our college and seminary days, a concordance, perhaps a couple of sets of well-thumbed pulpit commentaries, a Webster's **Collegiate** looking about as much-used as the Bible in our parishioners' parlors, reams of denominational periodicals, study course manuals, etc., and several shelves rather heavily stocked with brightly covered books of sermons written and delivered by successful divines and pulpiteers. This layman would also very likely see an anthology of quotable poems fit for every occasion, several hymnals and Bibles—one of the latter, Thompson's **Chain Reference,** lying open on our desk—possibly a volume of Shakespeare and Kipling, a history and a scientific treatise or two, a few novels old and new . . . . and this is just about all.

These are the tools of the man called to stand before an audience two and three times a week to feed its soul, compel its conscience, enlighten its mind and enlist its will. This audience with its multiple needs, its varieties of religious and cultural experiences, its social and intellectual strata, puts a tremendous strain upon any one who seeks week after week to minister to its deepest needs. No shepherd browsing in such a literary pasture as the one outlined above, regardless of his personal zeal and conviction, can hope to justify the ways of God to man to so diverse an audience.

When we call the roll of the reformers and the great masters of pulpit eloquence, we are immediately impressed with their wide learning and accurate scholarship. Martin Luther, Melanchthon, John Calvin, and Zwingli were men steeped in classic lore, history, and theology. They were scholars of the first magnitude. They were scholars before they became reformers. And in our day the theologians who are winning the ear of the world, such as Barth, Brunner and Niebuhr, are intellectual as well as spiritual heirs of the reformers. So too the men of the pulpit who spoke most compellingly to their generation and whose

words are still heard today, Crysostom of the early church, England's Robertson of Brighton, and America's Phillips Brooks, to name but three, are of this literary and cultural lineage.

Perhaps the pastor's study is a matter for the churchs' concern. Congregations should not only make it possible for their ministers to spend more time in their libraries, and even insist upon their doing so, but they should provide their pastors with solid libraries just as they provide them with comfortable parsonages. Modern furniture, excellent reading lamps, nice book cases filled with the best books, ancient and modern, the kind of books every pastor should read and few can afford, all this should greet the new pastor in his church as he moves into the parsonage with his family. No church can make a wiser investment. And wise is that pastor whose congregation, about to give him a new car, prevails upon his people to substitute such a library!

A PRAYER OF THANKSGIVING

By Lanneau D. Lide

"O Thou that inhabitest the praises of Israel,"
Sang the Psalmist of old.
And because Thou dost dwell in the hearts
of thy grateful people,
We seek the spirit of thankfulness,
That we may invoke the divine presence.

We would be grateful,
Not so much because the lines have fallen to us
In more pleasant places, perhaps,
Than to some others less fortunate,
But rather for the blessings we share with all mankind,
The gift of life upon this "goodly frame, the earth,"
With all its glorious possibilities,
And the unsearchable riches of our inheritance
All heirs of God and joint-heirs with Jesus Christ.

Amen.

Criticism And The Understanding Of The Bible

By E. F. Scott

Two very common misconceptions need to be cleared away before we can estimate the value of criticism for the preaching and the practical use of the Bible. There is first the idea that the critical enquiry is wholly modern, a product of the doubt and the restlessness which have afflicted the world during the last century. But we find, when we look back, that thoughtful men have always read the Bible critically. Jesus himself was the first critic of the Old Testament. The Pharisees took all its statements literally; he radical conclusions of modern scholars. It was only in the later church pierced beneath the letter and separated the abiding truth from all that was accidental and temporary. The authors of the New Testament had the critical spirit. Luke tells us in the preface to his Gospel that he had carefully examined the many traditions about Jesus in order to present his readers with verified facts. The works of the early fathers are full of critical suggestions, which sometimes anticipate the most that liberty was crushed out and men were all compelled to accept the given interpretations of the Bible

and its teaching. Criticism is not a modern invention. It may employ new methods and make use of knowledge which was not available in earlier times, but in its essence it is only a return to the original Christian attitude.

The other misconception which is still deeply rooted in the minds of many is that the aim of criticism is to discredit the Bible. For ages this book has stood out from all others as the word of God. Men have looked to its teaching as unquestionable and made it the corner stone of all their faith and practice. Criticism has presumed to pry into its origin, to dispute the certainty of much that is contained in it, to show how its message is related at every point to events in the past and to conditions which were different from those under which we are now living. As a result of this investigation the Bible loses its old authority, and this, we are told, is the deliberate purpose of its critics. They raise doubts concerning the sacred book so as to undermine the Christian religion. But it may confidently be said that a charge of this kind is utterly baseless. The aim of criticism is no other than to understand the Bible. It cannot be properly understood without some knowledge of how it came into being, and if we are to gain this knowledge we must forget many old assumptions and look solely at the facts. This is how progress is made in every branch of enquiry. Astronomers ceased to assume that the sun went round the earth and studied the actual motions of the two bodies. Historians threw aside the hazy traditions and explained the rise of nations from the records and monuments which still survived. No one can say that the solar system is less majestic now than it was to our forefathers, or that we have lost our patriotism because we no longer credit the old legends. No more need we give up the Bible if we agree with the critics that some of our former assumptions were mistaken. It is only poor and worthless things which wither under enquiry. If we believe in the Bible we ought to welcome all discoveries which enable us to see it as it really is.

The aim of criticism, therefore, is simply to find out the truth about this book which means so much to us. It may be granted that there are some scholars who try to belittle the Bible under cover of investigating its problems, but they cannot be properly regarded as critics. They are disowned by genuine critics just as much as by the most conservative believers. For the word "criticism" is only the Greek for "judgment," and the function of a judge is to consider the facts before him without any personal bias. A scholar who works with the set purpose of confuting the Bible may sometimes render useful service by emphasizing facts which have been slurred over by scholars of an opposite bias, but at best he is only an advocate, and cannot be allowed to pass judgment.

The critic, therefore, must look at the facts with an open mind. But although he is impartial he must have sympathies and convictions which enable him to appreciate the facts. A good judge rids himself of all bias, but he can make nothing of his task unless he has a strong moral sense which guides him in the right direction. A good critic examines the Bible impartially, but approaches this religious book in a religious spirit, for otherwise he can make nothing of its message. An eminent German critic who died some years ago wrote a very modest estimate of his life-work, but claimed that in one respect he had an advantage over his rivals. Some of them, he admitted, had very little religious belief, but they all had some lingering prejudice in favor of the Bible

teaching. He had carefully cleared his mind of all beliefs, so as to pursue his work of criticism with absolute freedom. One feels at once that a position like this is absurd. A man might claim as well that he was best fitted to write impartially about Mozart because he had no ear for music. No one who is insensitive to music can safely be trusted even to dust a piano, and an irreligious man is sure to go wrong when he meddles with any question, however trivial, which concerns the Bible. The critic must indeed seek only for the truth, and to this end must take account of all possibilities, however he may object to some of them. But he must have an open mind, open not only to doubts but to the glorious certainties of the Bible message.

Thus it is wrong to assume that criticism is in any way hostile to the teaching and authority of the Bible. Its whole object is to ascertain the truth about it, and the Bible is such a book that the more it is understood the more it discloses its wealth of meaning. This, indeed, is the more precious result of the work of criticism during the last century. People formerly took the Bible on trust, aware that much of it was obscure to them, but still accepting it as the store-house of divine wisdom. Very often there was a secret fear in their minds that the value placed on it was fictitious, and might melt away if all the facts were known. This was the true reason why the church for many centuries placed a ban on criticism, and why it is still regarded by many good Christians with suspicion. Might it not be that if the veil of mystery were withdrawn from the Bible it would prove to be empty or disappointing? It has now been exposed to the fiercest light of enquiry, but has become richer in meaning than it was before.

For one thing we can read the various writings in their proper setting. A picture is meaningless if the object it presents is isolated from its surroundings. A man's life is of little interest if we know nothing of the time he lived in and the people among whom he worked. It is the function of criticism to bring every part of the Bible into relation to its age and circumstances. Isaiah spoke a warning or a word of comfort; to whom did he speak it, and what was the occasion which called it forth? Paul wrote a letter to the Galatians; who were the Galatians? Where and when did he write the letter? What were the special difficulties which he had in view? In former times little attention was paid to such questions. Isaiah and Paul were only mouth-pieces through whom a voice came from heaven to the world at large. Criticism tries to see them as living personalities, and to read their message with the eyes of its first readers. Everything in the Bible is so treated, and this, it has been objected, is to throw back the book into a distant age and obscure its permanent meaning. But surely the very opposite is true. The Bible is brought near to us and made vital. We can feel that it was addressed to real persons and events that actually happened. As we transport ourselves into that past time we can see that its needs and problems were strangely like our own, so that we can listen to the message as spoken directly to ourselves. The preacher has to address men and women who are struggling with grim realities, and he is now aware that this is also the nature of the Bible. There is nothing in it that is abstract or imaginary. It was the outcome of hard experience and has guidance to offer us, almost wherever we open it, in our own daily conflict. Criticism has taught us to see the Bible in this light, and has thus pointed the way

to more practical and helpful preaching.

Again, it has brought home to us the great truth, implicit in all the Bible writings, that God speaks to men in concrete events. It was the ancient belief that the Old Testament writers were consciously looking forward to the future Messiah. They appeared to deal only with things happening in their own days but all the time they were speaking in veiled language of the great revelation which was to come. But criticism has discovered that there is little Messianic prophecy in the Old Testament. Most of the supposed forecasts can be best understood as referring to some present emergency in the life of Israel. But in deeper sense the old view has been justified. The writers think of God as revealing himself in the events of history. They are the acts of God, and he speaks to us in his acts. It follows that his supreme revelation will take the form of an event which will crown and explain all others. The Old Testament, as we have now learned to read it, exhibits God working through history, and we know him by what he visibly does. It may truly be said that the Old Testament histories, no less than the Gospel of John, are built around the theme, "The Word was made flesh." Criticism has done a real service to religion by insisting that the Bible must be read in no allegorical or metaphysical sense, but as a record of facts. It teaches us to see God manifested by the things he does, in our own lives and in the life of the world around us. If the preacher is to bring a vital message to this troubled age he must take his stand on this Bible conception. The events which are shaking everything have not happened blindly. God is speaking to us through them, and we must try to understand what he says.

Once more, criticism has helped us to penetrate beneath the surface to the essential meaning of the Bible. It was assumed in former times that since this was the word of God all parts of it were equally inspired and had a permanent value. By many ingenious methods the profoundest truths were wrung out of passages which on the face of them contained nothing but some antiquated law or mistaken theory. When everything in it was thus placed on the same level many honest men were compelled to own that they could not believe the Bible. Criticism has taught us to discriminate. It has recognized that the thought of the Bible was colored, like a river, by the soil through which it flowed. It was affected by the myths of other religions, by popular traditions, by customs and modes of thinking which had survived from primitive times. The writings grew up through a period of a thousand years and are often at variance with one another. They were produced sometimes under pressure of violent national feeling, and contain sentiments which offend our moral sense. Even in the New Testament, especially in Paul's Epistles, there are conceptions which can be traced back to Greek philosophy and to pagan cults which flourished in the first century. It is the task of criticism to analyze the Bible teaching and distinguish these alien elements, and in so doing it may often seem to be merely destructive. We wonder sometimes whether anything will be left when all the accretions from foreign sources have been removed. Yet it is perhaps just here that criticism has done its most valuable service. It has enabled us to sift out the mingled materials of the Bible and to separate the pure gold from the alloy. A thinker of today cannot but be influenced by interests and ideas which will have lost their meaning tomorrow, and this is equally true of the men who wrote the Bible. Much of their thought belonged

to their own time, and we wish to know what was permanent, what had come directly from God himself. The Bible as we read it in the light of criticism does not cease to be an inspired book, but we are learning where to look for the inspiration. It does not consist in those theories and speculations which have puzzled so many earnest enquirers in the past. These, for the most part, had crept in from the outside, and we can now define them as Babylonian or Persian or Greek. The Bible is inspired in so far as it sets forth the eternal principles of right action and brings home to us the wisdom and the goodness of God. This is the message which all these writers are seeking in their various ways to impart, and the task of the preacher is to discern it and make it real to the present day.

The value of criticism would be far more generally acknowledged if it were not for the arrogant attitude of many of its modern exponents. They assume that no one before them knew anything about the Bible. They pour ridicule on those who have studied it patiently by other methods, and dismiss all the old conclusions as out of date. The truth is that the Bible speaks for itself, and its main purport has always been clear. In some ways the critical interpretation has been more a hindrance than a help. It has forced attention to questions of date and language and authorship which after all are subsidiary, and blinded us, in some measure, to the things that matter. To appreciate a noble building you need to stand at a little distance away from it, and in this respect the plain reader of the Bible has a real advantage over the critic. He has another advantage, that it is easier for him to approach the book with reverence, and we must come to it in that attitude before it will yield its secret. For our fathers it was literally the word of God, and if they forgot that he had given it under human conditions and through human personality they were conscious of a truth which was far more important than all our new knowledge. But there is no reason why this knowledge should not deepen the spirit of reverence. The Bible is the most wonderful of all books, and the more we study it, in the fullest light of criticism, the more we can realize its wonder, and feel that it is indeed the word of God.

The Test of Poetry

By Sara Lowrey

Truth is the test of poetry. It is the supreme test of the worth of all forms of literature. The first question one should ask in judging a poem is whether or not it is true. Does it present a phase of truth?

The greatness of poetry is judged by the universality and permanence of the truth it reveals and the clarity and force with which the truth is conveyed.

I heard William Lyon Phelps speak upon the subject "The Romance of Science and the Truth of Fiction." In illustrating the romantic aspects of science Mr. Phelps spoke of the magic carpet in which he was brought through the rain in safety and comfort to the lecture platform that night. Surely the automobile, the airplane and the modern train are capable of giving us greater adventure than was dreamed of in Aladdin's lamp or the magic

carpet which transported one of faith so swiftly in his dreams.

Mr. Phelps pointed out, however, that scientific formulae are not necessarily permanent. A textbook in science becomes obsolete within a decade. But the truth of fiction is permanent.

We were impressed with the truth revealed by Euripides in "The Trojan Women" when the play was produced in Baylor University during World War II. Many women of the modern world experienced a captivity tragically similar to that of the Greek women depicted in the play written more than 2000 years ago.

Robinson Jeffers has written a free translation of **Medea** by Euripides. Judith Anderson is now playing the title role on the professional stage. I heard a professor in a prominent university say recently that Robinson Jeffers is saying to us through his poetry: "Man, look at what you are making of yourself."

Over and over the women in this play warn Medea not to entertain mad thoughts because they will express themselves in mad deeds. The poet makes it tragically clear that vengeance never settles anything but causes one's trouble to mount to more and more tragic heights. This poetic drama is presenting to the people of the United States today the truth perceived by Euripides more than twenty centuries ago. This truth is universal and permanent; and in the atomic era it may mean the destruction of civilization itself.

Poetic **form** is important only as a medium through which truth is presented. It is a means only. Its worth is in proportion to its clarity and force in conveying the truth the poet wishes to express. There is a saying **form is born of spirit.** There is much truth in this statement, though many young aspirants to poetry writing are inclined to take it too literally. The more emotional speech becomes, the more rhythmical. We find rhyme and meter within Lincoln's second inaugural address:

Fondly do we hope,
  Fervently do we pray,
That this mighty scourge of war
  May speedily pass away.

Inspiration alone, however, is not sufficient cause for clear, forceful and consistent form. A poet like every other artist should be a good craftsman and know basic forms. Then he may choose the form which will most adequately express his meaning.

Modern poets are frequently inclined not to follow traditional verse patterns. Free verse was the result of a desire for more freedom in rhythmic pattern than was found in strict adherence to traditional rhyme and meter. This tendency does not mean that the modern poets ignore rhythm or its importance in conveying moods and ideas. Archibald MacLeish explains in his preface to **Panic** that he attempted to find a verse form capable of catching and conveying the rhythm of the spoken language as typical of the modern American speech as Shakespeare's rhythm was characteristic of the Elizabethan period. This general attitude is maintained by many modern poets.

Poetic forms, or modes of expression, change with changing eras; just as customs, styles and forms of government vary. But basic truth is unchangeable. Hence, the story of Medea borrowed by Euripides from another playwright may be retold by Jeffers or any other dramatist or poet of and for any era. The truth revealed by this story is timeless. The new poetic form given by Jeffers makes the story more compelling to a modern audience than a literal translation from the Greek. Thus, we see that form is important as a means of communicating truth, but the real test of poetry is whether or not it reveals the truth.

HUNTSMAN*

Little man, little man,
where have you been?
Farther and nearer
than ever were seen.

Little man, little man,
what did you there?
I wakened an atom
asleep in its lair.

I shattered the atom
and shuddered to find
A power to destroy
or deliver mankind.

In the lair of an atom
where no man had trod,
I came upon Lucifer
challenging God.

—Mary White Slater

SEGREGATION

Out of his loneliness he cries,
And no one hears,
And though his eyes are dull and blurred,
There are no tears.

There is a fear that drains the soul
Like instant death,
A death that kills the heart but does
Not stop the breath.

Your brother stares at changing worlds
In dark distress,
Can you stand undisturbed and watch
Such loneliness?

Mabel Pyland Cooper.

*Reprinted from New York **Herald Tribune** by permission.

WE LIVE BY FAITH

We live by faith, chafe as we may at creeds—
we work the plow of law to fill our needs
and sleep like children, though we toss and sigh
as earth, our cradle swings across the sky.

We read in every sunset's line of gold,
sunrise will come. The glorious fact is old,
yet like young children fearful of night's gloom,
we wait the moon's pale rise, the stars' white bloom.

Whether we mock or pray or wondering scan,
or dare to measure God and show his plan,
behind our blunderings stand love and pain
and a still faith in law's eternal reign.

Whoever waits upon tomorrow's sun
trusts God unconsciously. And everyone
who hopes, gives hostage to the future's thrall
And by that hope declares his faith in all.

—Mary White Slater

Why Some Good Baptist Are Anti-Missionary

By John T. Wayland

We are embarrassed to note repeatedly that Southern Baptists are near the bottom of the list of denominations in per capita gifts to missions. The reasons for this fact are numerous. One of them is that our people are, on the average, poorer economically than the other larger church groups. I don't believe we have any more than our proportion of indifferent Christians, even if we do have a great many "sorry" Baptists. Our chief problem is that we have a large number of Christians in our Baptist Churches who are faithful in attendance at divine worship, who walk circumspectly, and who are honest and upright citizens, a credit to any community, but who give almost nothing for Kingdom work. Why do these good Baptists not support the missionary enterprise?

I believe that one of the major reasons is found in their theological tradition and training and in the comfortable condition in which it results. This theological tradition stems from the teachings of John Calvin and is particularly fatal to the missionary spirit in an overemphasis on the doctrine of election. God's sovereignty is stressed almost to the exclusion of man's responsibility. Calvin wrote "In conformity . . . to the clear doctrine of the Scripture, we assert, that by an eternal and immutable counsel, God has once for all determined, both whom he would admit to salvation, and whom he would condemn to destruction. We affirm that this counsel, as far as concerns the elect, is founded on his gratuitous mercy, totally irrespective of human merit; but to those whom he devotes to condemnation, the gate of life is closed by a just and irreprehensible, but incomprehensible, judgment."[1] Calvin had previously stated in his introduction to the doctrine that the discussion of it is made "very perplexed, and therefore dangerous, by human curiosity, which no barriers can restrain from wandering into forbidden labyrinths, and soaring beyond its sphere, as if determined to leave none of the Divine secrets unscrutinized or unexplored."[2]

It is our belief that man is totally depraved, having within himself nothing that may save him; that the initiative of salvation is from God, and that we are saved by the unmerited favor of God. But we also believe that we are saved through faith, that Christ has died for all men, that they are free to choose Him if they will, and that they are responsible for their choice of heaven or hell.

Some good Baptists overemphasizing the truth of God's election to salvation to the near exclusion of man's free will and responsibility lead themselves to many errors. The first is a wrong conception of the great idea of a "chosen people." A chosen people that exults in its own noble position soon partakes of the spirit of Pharisaism and self-satisfaction. When activated this attitude may issue in the idea of a superior race and order a concentration camp for others outside the chosen group. But with some of our Baptist friends who make God wholly responsible for His world it

---

[1] Hugh Thompson Kerr, Jr., ed, **Compend of the Institutes of the Christian Religion by John Calvin,** p. 129.

[2] **Ibid.**

issues in a very comforting and comfortable quiescence. God will save those whom He pleases when He pleases and I need not, indeed can not do anything about it. This view fits perfectly the weaknesses of human nature. It is an encouragement to ignorance, for there is no need to know about the peoples afar and missions to them. It is a comfort to miserliness, for there is no call to share. It is an invitation to laziness. Why organize to send those who need not go?

This citadel of anti-missionary spirit is particularly difficult to overcome because, being centered on itself, it does not appreciate outside "interference." There is a distrust of education. One of our Baptist ministers was offered the gift of a farm by his uncle if he would promise not to go to college and be "ruined." There is also inbreeding in ministerial supply and call. Few pastors are called from outside the community. There are plenty available inside and they are relatives and dear friends. Since men are mightily moved by the grace of God and called to the Gospel ministry in large numbers, some churches have several ordained ministers in the congregation and sometimes more than one is pastor at the same time. The tradition of the annual call prevails. The bountiful grace of God and the horrible judgment of God are preached in turn for the winning of the lost, and the chosen people rejoice in their salvation, but of their responsibility to God for the carrying of the Gospel to others nothing is said. Somehow or other the truth with which the Bible is filled, namely, that God's people are elected to fulfill His divine purpose, is overlooked. There is a failure to hear God's "and be thou a blessing" which follows immediately upon "I will bless thee."

Somehow young ministers from this anti-missionary group of good Baptists must be sent to our Seminaries and exposed to the whole truth of the Gospel and then sent back to be missionaries to a people who dwell in the twilight. Thus far those who have come out have become powerful preachers in our largest churches. Meanwhile preachers of their own blood are in twilight, a chosen people without a mission.

The Tragedy Of Misplaced Emphasis

By S. L. Morgan, Sr.

Now for some time this writer's role has been to sit on the sidelines and watch the game go on.

He has had the privileged role of the listener to a great variety of preachers and other speakers. He always listens with sympathy, looking for the best, and nearly always finding something profitable. But far too often the theme of preacher or teacher has been commonplace, when just as easily and appropriately one might have chosen the fundamental, the vital, the essential. Too often the hearer was left with a poignant sense of having been trifled with by the speaker, as though he thought the hearer wished to be given something pretty and entertaining, and cared not to be stirred to great living and doing. And too often the main emphasis was put on a minor instead of a major doctrine or practice.

In the writer's role as listener nothing has seemed more astonish

ing than the lack of discrimination between what one **may** and what one **must** believe. Often major emphasis was put on what one **may** believe, but which is not essential. The result of such misplaced emphasis too often has proved tragic, even to the loss of faith in the essential. The most obvious example of this is emphasis on the verbal inspiration and the infallibility of the Bible, even in matters of science. Because of this misplaced emphasis thousands of devout souls in the past lost all faith in the Bible and threw it overboard, as science began to prove that the world and life in it did not spring into being in seven days, but had been in the making perhaps millions of years. It was the tragedy of emphasis on the letter of Scripture, instead of on its essence as a revealer of God and the way of salvation and life. Here are three instances of misplaced emphasis.

1. God the Creator Versus a Theory of Creation

This writer has sometimes been alarmed on hearing a preacher or teacher with perfervid earnestness urging young people especially to accept all the Bible as the infallible word of God, and pronouncing the curse of Rev. 22:19 on anyone who didn't believe it "from cover to cover." And even illustrated it by the Genesis theory of creation in seven days, or God's alleged command to slaughter captive women and children, even to "infants and sucklings." Especially with thoughtful young people such a challenge is perilous to faith in God, faith in the Bible. One cringed, knowing that intelligent high school and college students would surely set over against the seven-day theory of creation the certain knowledge of science that the earth and all life have been evolving through ages, and that they would protest inwardly, "If I must accept **that** view of the Bible, I'll let it go!" and "If the God of the Old Testament could give such a savage order, away with it and Him!"

Another speaker, by contrast, told a great chapel group of young people: Beware of misplaced emphasis on religion! I warn you out of painful experience. In my first year in college I faced the issue of emphasis. I had been taught to put it on faith in the exact language of the Bible, including the seven-day creation. And here I was facing the demonstrated proof of science of a long process in creation. He told of going to a godly professor with his faith-shattering problem: "If I have to accept any theory of evolution, my Bible is gone! I see no alternative." The professor assured him the Bible was not given to teach science, but the way to God and life.

Gradually Christian people felt their way to solid ground through that cataclysm of evolution, and now see that they were upset only through holding a wrong view of what the Bible really is. The essence of its message is this, and this alone: All that matters is God and man's relation to him. And we are able to say with assurance, "Here is the created universe—miracle of miracles! Explain it without a great God back of it, you cannot. **How** he created it—in a moment, in seven days, or in a million years, is not vital. Put the emphasis where the Bible, rightly understood, puts it, on the mighty Creator, and rest your faith there and be at peace." That emphasis is safe—and saving. To put emphasis on the letter of the Genesis story is to misunderstand the purpose of the Bible and is perilous.

2. The Person of Christ versus a Theory About His Birth

A distinguished preacher was heard in an able address to emphasize the virgin birth as "a destiny-determining truth," since he regarded it as essential to establish-

ing the deity of Christ. To doubt the virgin birth, therefore, was to doubt his deity and to forfeit faith in his saviorhood. It was perilously close to declaring that faith in the virgin birth is **essential to salvation!** That is a hazardous statement, fortunately not true.

One's salvation depends on faith and obedience to Christ as **divine Lord,** not on **how he was born.** And it is hazardous to base his divine lordship on how he was born. E. Stanley Jones saw this clearly in a round table discussion in India when he was grilled for hours by a group of keen Indians trying to disprove the claims of Christianity. He focused the discussion on the sinless, majestic PERSON OF CHRIST. He refused to discuss any minor matter (**e. g.,** the virgin birth). He challenged: "There HE is; do your worst to HIM! HE is Christianity, its **essence,** its irreducible Minimum. If HE stands, Christianity stands with HIM." And all their shafts of criticism fell flat before the majestic "FACT OF CHRIST." As he came out a friend said to him eagerly, "I almost collapsed from tense anxiety, fearing you would not make good the claims of Christianity." He answered, "I felt perfectly at ease; I knew Christ could take care of himself, if only the issue were held on HIM."

There is a partial parallel in the theories of creation. Make a similar challenge to the doubting mind: "There is the created universe — that is the great MIRACLE; do your worst to the Genesis story; account for such a miracle apart from the great God of the story, you cannot. Focus your attention on the FACT OF THE MIRACLE; not on how it was created—whether in a moment, in seven days, or in a million million years. The miracle of the creation, the miracle of the PERSON OF CHRIST, each stands secure in its own right as divine, self-authenticating, with no need of any bolstering. To try to bolster it by any attention to the **how** of the miracle is to confuse the mind and weaken the self-authenticating appeal of the miracle itself. The approach of Dr. Jones to the virgin birth is the sounder and safer. He accepts the virgin birth but by reasoning back to it from the miraculous PERSON of Christ—not the opposite: given such a PERSON, it is natural and easy to believe he had a unique birth. And thus the virgin birth makes it easier to believe in the divinity of Christ. But to make his divinity **contingent** on how he was born is utterly another matter, and is unwarranted—and **hazardous.** What mortal dares to say how God **must** make a universe, or how he **must** have made Jesus into the divine being he was! To assume that it **must** have been by a virgin birth is both daring and hazardous. Who dares to say that God might not choose rather to infuse into the miracle of gradual, ordinary growth the added miracle of a greater interplay of the divine Spirit?

And despite the fascinating stories of the miraculous birth in Matthew and Luke, at least a shadow of doubt about the virgin birth lingers round it in a multitude of the keenest and devoutest minds. Many of them believe unwaveringly in the deity of Christ regardless of the virgin birth, just as many hold unwaveringly that God was the agent in creation regardless of whether he created in seven days or by an age-long process. And their arguments command respect: namely, that so far as we know, neither Jesus nor Paul ever mentioned the virgin birth; that only after years was there any doctrine of the virgin birth, or any serious discussion of it, among the early disciples, and that the doctrine slowly grew up parallel to the Roman Catholic doctrine of Mary as the "Mother of God." And these arguments give us pause the more because it is well

known that other peoples and religions have their traditions of virgin births of their heroes. For those reasons it is even hazardous to base the "destiny-determining doctrine" of the divinity of Christ as Lord on so insecure a foundation as a doctrine of the virgin birth. With Stanley Jones rather, gaze on the marvelous PERSON OF CHRIST! He needs no prop to support his claim to be the divine son of God. He stands majestic in his own right, his divinity self-authenticating to the reverent mind by something in him that commands one's homage.

3. The Bible In Its Essence versus a Theory of Inspiration

Judged by the consequences, the Christian centuries record no greater tragedy than that of exalting this or that theory of inspiration above the essence of the Bible itself. Especially since Luther and Calvin set "the plain sense of Scripture" against the authority of the Roman Church, a rigid theory of verbal inspiration has worked havoc. The alleged commands of Jehovah to slaughter Israel's enemies were quoted to justify the Crusades—the slaughter of "infidels" by "Christians"—and even lately have been quoted often to justify the slaughter of Germans and Japanese. On the "authority" of "the plain word of Scripture" Gallileo was imprisoned for teaching the earth is round. On a plain Mosaic command, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live," 100,000 wretches, many of them demented, were slaughtered as witches in Europe and 20 in Salem, Mass.

Even such crimes, revolting as they are, committed on the supposed authority of "the plain word of God," are perhaps not the greatest injury done by exalting the mere letter of the Scripture. Even greater, because more widespread and continuous, is the injury to multitudes of thinking people, especially to youth, by the common teaching that all the Bible is equally inspired and so on the same moral level, and without either textual or scientific errors. Thoughtful youth soon discovers that the God of the early Old Testament stories is represented as doing unethical and cruel things. They discover statements of fact contradicted by the plain teaching of science. They learn that many slight errors crept into the text of Scripture. With such knowledge it is perilous to youth to insist, as many still do, that one must believe the Bible "from cover to cover." For traditionally this has meant that every word must be left to mean "exactly what it says." Left alone without careful definition, this means that all acts and commands attributed to God are right, that the Bible writer's point of view is always correct, regardless of the present consensus of science, and that the Bible is free from errors of every sort.

Such a view of the Bible soon ceases to satisfy the thoughtful, and easily plays into the hands of its enemies. Why were Tom Paine and Robert G. Ingersoll able to sweep thousands into doubt or positive scepticism? Precisely because such extravagant claims made for the Bible by its friends were easy to explode. They were so for either friendly or unfriendly critics. To claim too much and to have those claims disproved has forfeited the faith of thousands in the Bible. The only safety is in carefully teaching that the Bible is a progressive revelation, the older portions often setting forth unethical concepts, even of a God who was vengeful and cruel at times. Jesus expressly declared this as the proper attitude to the Old Testament. Repeatedly in the Sermon on the Mount he says, "They of old time said this, and this; but I give you a new and higher concept of God and his requirements." Equally important, we must not insist that the Bible be held to accuracy in matters of science or psychology or philosophy or

the cause of a disease, but only that it is a safe and sure guide for finding God and salvation in him.

The same method is proposed to establish the divine quality of the Bible as that proposed to establish the certainty of a great God back of the universe, or to establish the divinity of Christ: There is THE BOOK; do your worst to it; point out the unethical character attributed to God in the early books of the Bible—and go to the New Testament and correct that concept by the concept presented by the God and Father of Jesus; point out, if you will, the low moral standard of even some of the Mosaic laws—and correct them by the higher ethical standard of Jesus: "They of old time said . . . but I say." Charge, if you will, that it has errors of science and psychology and other ideas limited by the dim knowledge of that distant day; but discredit it in its own special field, you cannot—God and sin and salvation. In that field it stands supreme and alone among all the books of the world, entitled to be called THE BOOK. It certifies itself to the religious sense by an incomparable divine quality. So it has done for millions who have declared sincerely in the famous phrase of Coleridge, "**It finds me.**" Or in a more famous phrase, "Never man spake like this." It makes this unique impression on the religious sense because the essence of it amazingly fits man's need. In **How to Read the Bible** Goodspeed sums up his impression of the Bible by saying, "Its chief significance for all of us is its amazing sense of the nearness and indeed the presence of God." Men feel "it somehow brings them near to God; they even seem to find him in its pages."

This amazing, self-authenticating, transforming power of the Bible is proved in the life of peoples and nations. The Jews loved it passionately and became the "people of a Book," and through the ages the Book made them a people apart, one of the marvels of history. Green in his **History of the English People,** declares that the eager reading of the Bible printed in the language of the plain people completely changed the moral tone of the entire nation. Our soldiers in the late war found nothing more amazing in the South Seas than what the Bible had done to turn the fuzzy-headed cannibals into beautiful, Bible-reading, church-going Christians.

And one is not left to the testimony of others; one may prove the Bible is divine **in his own experience.** It is the scientific test—that proposed by Jesus to test his own divineness and that of the words he spoke: "Will to do his will," and one comes to **know. Obey the Book,** and one proves it divine to his own heart, because it is **found to fit his need.**

Communism: What It Is And What To Do About It

By Kelley Barnett

Communism is on our nerves. At home Communism is a nuisance, it irritates us; abroad, it is danger number one, it scares us. However, Communism cannot be overcome in a mood of irritation and fear. In fighting Communism we must know the facts. Furthermore, Communism must be fought within the framework of Democracy. Our Democracy will be destroyed from within if we become a fascistic nation in our attempts to oppose Communism. Remember Hitler? He enslaved Germany in order to save her from the chains of Russia. It is the purpose of this article to set forth within a limited space the facts concerning Communism and to make some suggestions as to how Communism may be fought within the framework of Democracy.

Communism was born one hundred years ago at that point in history when the Industrial Revolution was enriching the owners and making the conditions of the worker unbearable. Children eleven and twelve years of age went to work in the mines and factories before daybreak and stumbled home after dark to their wretched hovels. Conditions of work were unsanitary and dangerous. Furthermore the organization of labor unions was forbidden.

The deplorable conditions of the workers did not go unnoticed. Robert Owen in England and Saint Simon in France advocated forms of socialism. They sought to solve the problem by peaceful reform and social legislation. Lord Shaftesbury led England to pass a number of important acts helping the worker. These acts included: Mines and Collieries Act, 1842, the Factory Act of 1847, and the Lodging House Statutes, 1851. Shaftesbury met the needs of the workers within the framework of English Democracy.

However, two young men, Frederich Engels, son of a German textile manufacturer, and Karl Marx, descendant of a long line of Jewish Rabbis, had another answer for the misery of the workers—Communism. They gave their answer to the world in February, 1848, by the publication of the **Communist Manifesto.**

Let us examine briefly the contentions of this Manifesto and the ideas which developed out of it. Humanity is divided into social classes. These classes at any period in history are derived from the nature of the economic system. Two classes were produced by the Industrial Revolution: the bourgeoisie (shop keepers or owners) those who own the factories; and the Proletariat (those who have no property), those who work for wages in the factories. Marx was convinced that the workers were being cheated by the owners. As he saw it the worker produced enough to pay for his wages, but he also produced more, a surplus which as profit went into the pocket of the owner. A man's labor was simply a commodity to be bought as an instrument in the production of goods and to be discarded when the worker's strength was gone.

Labor must have the surplus it produced. But how? Marx dismissed the proposals of Saint Simon, Fourier and others of this school as Utopian and foolish. Nor did he have any hope that reform by social legislation such as advocated by Shaftesbury would be successful. These men had trusted in reason,

justice and humanitarianism to help the workers. But for Marx, reason, justice, and sympathy were so many empty words, behind which Capitalism hid to do its exploitation. For Marx there was only one answer—Revolution. For he thought that the State could not be depended on for reform since the State is controlled, not by its legislators, but by the bourgeoisie that buy legislators by the dozens.

What about religion as a means of reform? "Of course not," Marx would say, "religion is the opium of the masses lulling the indignant worker into docility." Expect the owners to share the profit? Nonesense! Marx would argue, no ruling class has ever voluntarily released its power. At the point of the bayonet the ruling class becomes unselfish. For Marx there was only one answer, the violent overthrow of Capitalism and with it the class state. Then on the ruins under the direction of the dictatorship of the Proletariat a classless society of communal ownership would be established.

In order to stabilize this new order it would be necessary for the Proletariat to set up a temporary dictatorship. However, as soon as all danger of a counter revolution is passed the dictatorship will voluntarily lay down its power and the workers will rule. This is the Communist heaven.

The aim of Communism, then, is to replace Capitalism with communal ownership, the modern state with a classless state and in so doing destroy religion, for religion prolongs the rule of the bourgeoisie. This aim is achieved by revolution.

Marx was hardheaded. He was not concerned about a dramatic revolution in which people go on a lark, bang guns, drive the government in exile, elect a new President and go back to work. For Marx the revolution must be completely successful. No revolution should be attempted until the decisive momen had come—the moment that mad the success of the Revolution cer tain.

Communism teaches that it is th task of the working class to brin about the decisive moment of revo lution. But the working class wil not revolt until it sees the true na ture of its conditions. To prepar the working class for revolution i the task of Communism. In othe words, the working class must hav the scales removed from its eye As a class it must come to see tha religion is only a delirium, that ther is no real justice in a state domi nated by Capitalists, and that revo lution is the only answer.

Marx knew that only desperatio or a reasonable assurance of suc cess will lead men to risk their neck in revolt against entrenched powe Marx was sure that the lot of th workers would worsen, thereby pro viding the desperation; he was als certain that the revolt would be suc cessful, for Marx thought that clas struggle was inevitable and that th working class would win. Marx, i other words, did not think that h was setting forth a theory; he wa convinced that he had found th clue to history and could therefor predict the outcome of the struggle His certainty was so great that h openly stated in the Manifesto:

"Communists scorn to hide thei aims and views. They openly de clare that their purposes can onl be achieved by the forcible over throw of the whole extant social or der. Let the ruling classes trembl at the prospect of a communist rev olution. Proletarians have nothing t lose but their chains. They have world to win. Proletarians of a lands, unite!"

Obviously we can expect a num ber of differences between Com munism as set forth by Marx an Engels a hundred years ago an Communism as practiced by Sovie Russia. However, these difference

need not concern us. Yesterday and today the fundamental aim of Communism is a world-wide classless society, a society that will come about as nation by nation is overcome by communist strategy. The steps are the arousing of the Proletariat, the weakening of the owners and the destruction of the State, followed by the dictatorship of the Proletariat. However, we have yet to see in any nation the dictatorship surrendering their power to the people.

As we face the problem of Communism at home and abroad it is well to remember that we are dealing with a ruthless, realistic foe that long ago discarded the moral and religious restraints of western civilization, holding that good is that which promotes the world revolution and bad is that which destroys it.

Furthermore we are dealing with foes who are fanatically convinced that they have discovered the key to history and that they therefore are bound to succeed. We are dealing with a people who cherish religiously a hope that there is a new world, a borning of happiness and peace. Our foe is therefore armed to the teeth with self-assurance that amounts to a suicidal devotion to a cause.

Recent success in Europe has added to this assurance. Save for one major setback, the failure of Italy to go Communistic, the Soviet Union has been successful in her efforts to spread her gospel. Since 1945 fifteen nations with a population of 300 million have gone Communist. In other words as far as population is concerned twice the number of people in the U. S. have come under the hammer and sickle in the last three years.

The aim of Communism is a world revolution in which a society resting on communal ownership will replace our present order. Communism's immediate aim is to strengthen the Soviet Union, the spearhead of the Proletarian revolution.

WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE

DAS KELLY BARNETT is Columbus Roberts Professor of Sociology, Mercer University, Macon, Ga. Dr. Barnett was formerly editor of **Christian Frontiers.**

SARA LOWREY is in the Department of Speech, Baylor University, Waco, Texas. Miss Lowrey is poetry editor of **Christian Frontiers.**

S. L. MORGAN is a retired Baptist minister living in Wake Forest, N. C. Mr. Morgan has contributed articles frequently to this publication and others throughout the South.

ERNEST F. SCOTT is Professor Emeritus, Union Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y. Eminent New Testament scholar and author of **The Varieties of New Testament Religion, The Nature of the Early Church,** and **The Beginnings of the Church.**

MARY WHITE SLATER lives in Ironton, Ohio. Her poem "Huntsman" is reprinted from the New York **Herald-Tribune** by permission.

JOHN T. WAYLAND is Pastor of the First Baptist Church in North Wilkesboro, N. C.

LANNEAU D. LIDE is Judge, Twelfth Judicial District, retired, in Marion, S. C.

MABEL PYLAND COOPER is a frequent contributor of poetry to various publications and lives in Dallas, Texas, where she is president of the Dallas Dramatic Readers Club and secretary the Texas Poetry Society.

Correspondence

P. O. Box 2144
Fort Worth 1, Texas
September 23, 1948

Editors, **Christian Frontiers**
Box 508
Chapel Hill, N. C.

Dear Sirs,

Some circles in American religious life have developed a distaste for some of the traditional denominational names. Certain group names seem to these to be consistent with Christian principles while others, such as Baptist, are regarded as unworthy designations for Christian groups. Now the principles which historically separate Baptists from other Christian bodies seem to me to have a fundamental validity. If by clinging to regenerate church membership, congregational government, and complete freedom of conscience I stand to be called a Baptist, I cannot be ashamed of the name. However, there has arisen among us the use of a particular term which seems to me to be unfortunate. I have in mind the frequency with which one meets the expression "Southern Baptist."

There are times when Southern Baptists as a group need to be distinguished from other Baptist groups. In such cases the term is quite necessary; however, one meets the phrase so often where "Baptist" alone would do so well that the "Southern" seems not only superfluous but also anomalous. In fact the two words flow together so freely from certain lips and pens that the spelling "Southern-baptist" appears natural, with "Southern" taking the capital. The implication of the way this expression is used is that a Southern Baptist is a very special kind of Baptist. This is at once both false and foolish. The things that make the name Baptist worth bearing are shared by us with Baptists wherever they are found throughout the world. If there is anything which distinguishes us from other Baptists, it is the fact that we were born in the defense of slavery and have less of the Christian spirit of cooperation than our brothers. I cannot see that either of these is anything to be proud of. Let us speak of ourselves as Christians whenever possible, but when the use of a denominational name is needed, please, let us be just plain Baptists.

Sincerely,
JOSEPH F. GREEN, JR.